DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 942 IR 006 494

AUTHOR Guyatt, Joy
TITLE The Role of the University's Library Resources in Teaching and Learning in the Department of Government.
INSTITUTION Queensland Univ., Brisbane (Australia). Teritary Education Inst.
PUB DATE Oct 76
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Planning; Educational Objectives; *Faculty; Information Needs; Interprofessional Relationship; Library Materials; Library Reference Services; *Library Role; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Undergraduate Students; *University Libraries; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Australia (Brisbane)

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive report of a six-month study that investigated the way the Department of Government at the University of Queensland used the university's library resources is presented. Groups participating in the study (students, library staff, and faculty) are identified, and the methods of data collection are explained. Over 40 data tables provide the objective findings. Conclusions drawn from the study include ideas for establishing teaching objectives for courses, developing the accessibility and availability of appropriate library materials, and increasing communication between library and academic staff. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED163942

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S LIBRARY RESOURCES IN TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT

by

JOY GUYATT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ernest Roe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR006494

Tertiary Education Institute
October 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD		(iv)
SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS		1
1.0	BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY	2
	1.1 Introduction	2
	1.2 The Library	3
	1.3 The Government Department	4
	1.4 The Students	6
	1.5 Methodology	6
2.0	ACADEMIC STAFF AND THE LIBRARY	10
	2.1 Introduction	10
	2.2 Use of the Library by Staff	10
	2.2.1 Libraries Visited	10
	2.2.2 Frequency of Seeking Information	11
	2.2.3 Use of Bibliographic Tools	12
	2.2.4 Success in Finding Information	13
	2.2.5 Contacts with Library Staff	14
	2.3 Subject Planning and the Library	14
	2.3.1 Information for the Library	14
	2.3.2 Contact with Readers' Advisor	15
	2.3.3 Staff Expectations about Library Holdings	16
	2.4 Communication with Students	17
	2.4.1 Reading Lists	17
	2.4.2 Purposes of Reading Lists	18
	2.4.3 Staff Response to Students' Inability to Find Material	19
	2.4.4 References Given during the Course	20
	2.4.5 Staff Expectations about Students' Library Skills	22
	2.4.6 Instruction in Using the Library	23
	2.4.7 Staff Response to Students with Library Problems	23
	2.4.8 Extent of Satisfaction of Government Staff	25
3.0	STUDENTS AND THE LIBRARY	26
	3.1 Introduction and Basic Data	26
	3.2 Use of the Library by Students	27
	3.2.1 Libraries Visited	27
	3.2.2 Advisory Material Read or Used	28

Page

3.2.3 Formal Instruction in Using the Library 29

3.2.4 Where Students Looked for Material 31

3.2.5 Use of Bibliographic Tools 32

3.2.6 Difficulty in Finding Material for Government Subjects 33

3.2.7 Help Requested 34

3.2.8 Success in Finding Material for Government Subjects 35

3.2.9 The Influence of Reader Education on Success 36

3.3 Information Given to Students 41

3.3.1 Reading Lists 41

3.3.2 References Given in Class 42

3.3.3 Individual Staff - Student Discussions 47

4.0 THE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT'S USE OF LIBRARY MATERIAL FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING 48

4.1 Teaching Objectives 48

4.2 The Use of Reading Lists 49

4.3 Guiding Students' Reading in Three Undergraduate Subjects 50

4.4 The Undergraduate Library in the University of Queensland Library System 52

4.5 Subject Planning and the Library 53

4.5.1 Advance Information Sent to the Library 53

4.5.2 Communication Between the Readers' Advisor and the Staff 54

4.5.3 Staff Expectations About Library Holdings in Their Subjects 55

4.6 Communication About Library Materials Between Academic Staff and Their Students 56

4.6.1 Reading Lists and References Given in Class 56

4.6.2 Staff Expectations About Use of the Library by Students 57

4.7 Use of the Library by Students 57

4.7.1 Libraries Visited 57

4.7.2 Advisory Material and Formal Instruction in Using the Library 58

4.7.3 Use of Bibliographic Tools 59

4.7.4 Success in Finding Material for Government Subjects 61

4.7.5 The Influence of Reader Education on Success 61

		Page
	4.7.6 Some Reasons For Lack of Success	62
	4.7.7 Help Requested	63
4.8	Use of the Library by Academic Staff	65
	4.8.1 Libraries Visited	65
	4.8.2 Information Sought	66
	4.8.3 Use of Bibliographic Tools	66
	4.8.4 Success in Finding	67
	4.8.5 Help Requested	67
	4.8.6 Reasons For Satisfaction?	68

FOREWORD

TEDI is glad to have this opportunity to publish Joy Guyatt's comprehensive report on her project with the Department of Government. I am grateful to her both for her energetic and productive efforts and for her pleasant company as a member of our team during the six months she was on full-time secondment to us from her normal post as the University's Undergraduate Librarian.

I must also congratulate the staff of the Department of Government for setting an excellent example by allowing their attitudes and practices to be scrutinised for the benefit of the rest of us. Although inevitably the detailed evidence reveals shortcomings and deficiencies, there is no reason whatever to suppose that these are either more or worse than in other departments; indeed, the willing cooperation and constructive approach of the Government staff in the face of Ms Guyatt's interventions is more likely to mean the opposite.

Since a major purpose of the project, directly corresponding to TEDI's own major function, was to point ways to improvement and to a more efficient and economical use of both material and human resources, the identification of what is less than effective is an essential first step. The study seems to me to have identified a number of important problems, and to have hinted at others. I should like, in this foreword, to draw attention to some of them.

They are not, I hasten to add, necessarily related to significant shortcomings in the Department of Government! In many cases I am reminded of them by Ms Guyatt's report and they link up in my mind with other evidence collected at other times and places. Nor are they in any order of significance.

(1) One of the most heartfelt pleas that library staff would make to academic staff is - if you're about to <u>dash off</u> a reading list for your students, don't! And students would add their voices to that plea because great difficulties are caused for them by hastily-compiled reading lists, by reading lists with insufficient information about what their lecturers expect, by reading lists which reach the Library too late for books to be obtained in sufficient numbers, and much else. There's nothing good or bad about reading lists per se. But if they are to play an effective part in the processes of teaching and learning, they need time and care devoted to them, and they <u>demand</u> effective communication at all stages between lecturing staff and library staff. Even Government students had problems, and didn't always do what the staff intended them to do.

(2) Giving references orally - for example, during lectures and tutorials - is of dubious value, and often creates similar or even more acute problems. If you are citing a reference simply to demonstrate that you are a scholar, make this clear, so that you don't create a panic among 100 students who get a message that they must read it at once because it is <u>the</u> book (and there is one copy only in the Library).

(3) Students don't often ask academic staff for help in matters such as those under investigation in this project.

(4) Users have difficulty in differentiating among the various grades and levels of library staff; librarians, if Ms Guyatt's comments represent the general view, count on this differentiation being achieved by people who come into the Library; librarians expect users to approach those members of the library staff best able to help them. It seems unlikely that users will develop an instinct which distinguishes an (untrained) library assistant from a (professional) librarian if they "look the same". Some form of labelling, badge, uniform or other immediately recognisable difference seems necessary.

(5) There is much to be said about "reader education" - that is, imparting to library users the skills they need if they are to be efficient library users - and many problems to be pondered. Ms Guyatt's study indicates, as have many other investigations here and elsewhere, that most students lack these skills and have little knowledge of systematic ways of searching for information, that staff expectations of what students will achieve in a library tend to be unrealistic, and that reader education programmes are disappointingly unsuccessful (or, to phrase it most optimistically, that evidence for the success of reader education programmes continues to be elusive).

If advances are to be made, we need to get rid of some ancient fallacies about using a library (for example, that searching for material and not finding anything has some educational value) and face up to some hard decisions (for example, if students lack library skills, how are they to learn them, who is to teach them, and how?). It seems that some academic staff adopt an attitude towards this matter which is oddly self-defeating. If one is pro-learning and anti-teaching (a defensible viewpoint if one's view of teaching is narrow and confined to a kind of conditioning or spoon-feeding process), why carry that to the point of taking no interest in helping students acquire those skills which will enable them to be independent? Students' acquisition of library skills needs to be attended to within disciplines, through joint efforts of academic staff, library staff and students; and the same case can be made for acquisition of other skills in that complex of skills which make up the "good student". It is encouraging news that there is, in this University, a considerable and increasing volume of activity in this important "reader education" area.

Finally, academic staff may be provoked to think about their students' library skills by such questions as these: what differences are there in your expectations of, and the way you treat, students of different 'years' or levels? is it essential for students to go beyond textbooks and duplicated material in the first level subjects you teach? if so, why? if not, why not?

(6) The problem here can be raised simply by a quotation from the Report - "Students often need help not in finding material but in interpreting the essay question." The fact that library staff feel a need to devote substantial amounts of time to providing this kind of assistance is relevant to major issues concerning the "educational" role of librarians and their part in the teaching-learning transactions between academic staff and students.

Ms Guyatt's work in the Department of Government is a significant milestone. Departments often, and commendably, investigate aspects of their own activities in search of improvement. This time TEDI was involved in its first large-scale study in a single department. There are obvious advantages in this kind of approach - the objective appraisal from outside, the outsider sees most of the game, the difference in (and greater breadth of) perspective. On this occasion the project was carried out by a senior member of the University staff who was on full-time secondment to us and was not a member of staff of the department being surveyed. Other such projects could be profitably undertaken by a member of staff seconded to us to study from the outside his/her own department. Whatever the precise format adopted for a specific instance, TEDI staff will be happy to use their resources to assist other departments similarly. The value of such an exercise can be considerable for an individual department and amply justify the resources used; but further, there is often much to be learned for the benefit of the whole University from studies of single departments. This Report, I believe, is one such study.

ERNEST ROE
Director - TEDI

October 1976

Summary of Conclusions Drawn From a Study of the Role of the University's Library Resources in Teaching and Learning in the Department of Government

1. Teaching Objectives

More than six months before a subject is to be taught, objectives should be defined and decisions made about the Library materials needed to support the subject to ensure the greatest advantage from a proper interaction between the content of the subject, way of teaching and information sources.

2. Library Materials

With the help of the Library staff, the availability of Library materials should be established and decisions taken about how the materials will be made accessible to students.

Available Library materials are those:

- which are already in the Library with copies sufficient to meet anticipated needs
- which can be purchased or otherwise obtained before the time they will be needed by students
- which can be purchased, if not already held, from available funds

3. Communication About Library Materials

Printed or duplicated communications about Library materials should contain, at least, clear indications of the relative importance of the items mentioned for the subject, essay or tutorial paper and should state the way in which the lecturer expects them to be used.

Communications such as those referred to in the preceding paragraph should be sent to the appropriate Library staff at least four weeks before they are given to students.

Consideration should be given to whether a communication prepared for students contains all the information required by, or is in the form most useful for, Library staff.

4. Efficient Use of Available Library Materials

With the help of Library staff students should be shown how to find Library material relevant to specific subjects, essays or tutorial papers.

When teaching depends on reference to Library materials, it should be planned to make as much use as possible of material already in the Library.

The Role of the University's Library Resources in Teaching and Learning in the Department of Government

1.0 BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

This is the Report of an investigation carried out, with the assistance of the staff of the Tertiary Education Institute, by the Undergraduate Librarian on full-time secondment for six months to TEDI. An attempt was made to trace in detail the attitudes and practices of both staff and students of the Government Department with respect to the use of library resources in the teaching and study of Government subjects.

The Library is involved in two aspects of teaching and learning in the University, as well as making a contribution to general education by organising and making available for use, a collection of scholarly literature. One of these is meeting research needs, including the preparation of post-graduate theses, and the other is supporting those undergraduate courses which require a range of sources of information in a variety of forms.

Library resources for research must be accumulated during years of co-operation between library and academic staff, preferably with some rationalisation across the nation. The newer universities work for a long time under great disadvantages in this respect, and periods of inadequate funding to support the building of a research collection leave their mark for the future. The librarian can help the researcher beginning work in a particular field by setting before him the bibliographic tools in the field and drawing to his attention resources in cognate disciplines. It is often librarians, working with scholars, who compile the select bibliographies and who recognise gaps in bibliographic access to information and try to fill them. The emphasis in teaching and learning of this kind is a sound collection in the field, the prompt accession of all recent scholarly works and efficient searching of the literature.

Library staff have an interest in helping learning to take place, not only as an exercise involving scholars and professional librarians, but also in actively supporting the teaching of large classes of students with whom they share the pressures of essays, tutorial papers and examinations. Providing the material recommended by teachers for large classes of undergraduate students is a different undertaking from supporting research. The scholar-researcher has presumably attained a high level of expertise in his chosen field and is highly motivated towards the achievement of his goal. This must also apply to some undergraduate students. However, especially during their early years at a university, undergraduate students can be described as a "mixed bag" in background, potential ability and motivation.

It is a population which shows varying behaviour patterns from year to year and from faculty to faculty. It is probable that for many of them most learning in their subjects takes place at the specific direction of the teacher. Some teachers specify

one or more textbooks, a number of reference books and periodical articles, "readings" from which the student may hope to find material for the essays and papers by which his learning is assessed and his future decided. Some teachers believe that no student can attain a satisfactory understanding of his subject unless he has read a particular book, part of a book, or a particular periodical article. Others expect students not only to find for themselves material relevant to their subjects, but also to find out how to find it. All of these approaches to learning and teaching affect not only students, but also the Library by making demands on its staff and other resources.

In this situation the Library staff try to meet the expectations of academic staff and the demands of students, no matter how unreal they may be, usually with little or no opportunity to influence the content, method or resources of the courses from which these pressures and expectations arise.

This specialised study of the role of the University's library resources in teaching and learning in the Department of Government in the University of Queensland during the first semester of 1976 covers teaching at both the post-graduate and undergraduate levels. It should have implications for teaching and learning in the social sciences in universities where large classes are required to read widely from books and periodicals on theoretical, historical and current topics, where undergraduate students are encouraged to read from primary sources, and where original research is expected from later year students. Substantial library resources are required if these kinds of teaching are to be effective and students must be guided in their use of the literature.

1.2 The Library

The University of Queensland Library, with a collection of over 900,000 volumes, is organised as a Central Library and 16 branch libraries. A complete catalogue of the collection is housed in the Central Library, each branch having a catalogue of that part of the collection it was established to service, and, while the largest collection of bibliographic tools is in the Central Library, each branch library houses those most commonly used with its collection. The Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences are served mainly from the Central and Undergraduate Libraries, although both staff and students may use, on a variety of conditions, any item in the collection. The Central Library houses the research collection, while the Undergraduate Library provides material, often in multiple copies, selected to meet the needs arising from courses in the Faculties of Arts, Commerce and Economics, Education and Social Work. The Thatcher Memorial Library offers postal services to students enrolled in Arts and Education subjects offered by the Department of External Studies.

From the use made of the collection, and of the inter-library loan service, by the staff of the Government Department, the holdings of the Library were apparently adequate for their purposes, except for the known deficiency arising from delays in the receipt of current

newspapers and periodicals from major overseas countries. The Undergraduate Library held about 90 per cent of the titles on the reading lists prepared for students for the first semester of 1976. The most notable deficiency was in the number of copies of certain titles for two first level subjects and one second level subject with large enrolments. For another second level subject, 25 out of 71 titles listed were not held.[1] Multiple copies from the Central Library had formed the basis of the collection when the Undergraduate Library was established in 1973 and approximately $6,000 had been spent on material for Government subjects during the years 1973-75.

In the Central Library, the staff of Reference Services offer a range of services to staff and students through a collection of sophisticated bibliographic tools and ready reference material and the Reader Education Librarian is directly responsible for programmes of reader education for users of that Library. In the Undergraduate Library, Readers' Advisers, while sharing administrative and housekeeping tasks, see their main function as educational and their responsibility directly to students. As far as possible they relate their activities in building and servicing the collection, and in their contacts with students, to the teaching done by their academic colleagues.

1.3 The Government Department

During the first semester of 1976, 21 academics of the Department of Government, including three senior tutors and two tutors, taught 29 courses with enrolments ranging from one to 423 students. Two of these had joined the Department at the beginning of the semester, and two were ill, one for a long and one for a shorter period. Three positions for academic staff had not been filled. One member of staff who was on study leave and a third tutor who was appointed in April 1976, are not included in this study.

Because of staff shortages, the participation by tutorial staff in planning and teaching some subjects was greater than usual. For some staff members, the first semester of 1976 was unusual because of abnormally low enrolments for their subjects and for one, the way he taught was unusual because his students were required to study a local government election held early in the semester. For most subjects the content was the same or substantially the same as it was the year before and substantially different for only one undergraduate and three post-graduate subjects.

A statement, Government and why you should study it, in the Departmental handbook indicates the range of questions of interest to the Department: "... political science aims to produce in a rational and systematic way a body of knowledge about politics

---

[1] This information and other advice about interactions between Library and academic staff and about interactions between Library staff and students was provided by the Readers' Adviser for Government subjects.

(understood as the process of authoritatively allocating values in a community)... [It] aims at a body of knowledge which makes politics comprehensible and which can be applied to make politics work for the general good. Thus far, we of the Department of Government might agree. Less agreement exists on what methods are most appropriate in studying politics; on what parts of our body of knowledge are central to political science; and on the extent to which we should be concerned with making politics work for the general good." There is a brief discussion of the different methodologies used in the study of politics and the various kinds of orientation of the courses offered by the Department which, nevertheless, use"... a common vocabulary to conceptualise, and look at the same models as bench marks for comparison." Students are advised to "shop about" to find the courses which suit their interests and intellectual bent; for example, a student who found the course, Modern Political Ideologies, too theoretical for his taste did not choose well. The courses offered fall generally into the fields of Australian government, Asian government, political theory, public administration, political behaviour, public policy and comparative government.

A resource additional to those provided by the Library is the collection, established by the Department in 1966, of clippings from all major Australian metropolitan daily newspapers, the major weekly newspapers and a selection of Queensland provincial newspapers. The clippings in the Newspaper Room are filed in date order under subject headings (which are listed separately). "There are national government files for issues and organisations affecting Australia as a whole, state government files for state issues and institutions, and local government files for local government issues and institutions."[2]

Four first level subjects, 11 second level subjects,[3] one other subject which gave students who had fulfilled certain conditions an opportunity for independent study, a B.A. honours course and 11 post-graduate subjects were offered in first semester 1976. The 11 post-graduate subjects were offered for three course-work master's degrees administered by other departments and for two organised principally by the Government Department. Of these 28 subjects, five were offered for the first time and one was offered for Diploma in Social Planning students only.[4] The 28 subjects considered in this study comprise most, but not all of the subjects taught by members of the Department, for example one staff member taught a subject within the Department of External Studies and others taught subjects within the Department of Anthropology and Sociology. Some subjects were planned and taught by more than one person. Tutors and senior tutors participated in the teaching of two introductory subjects for which there were enrolments of 423 and 185 respectively, one senior tutor helped with the supervision of the students studying

---

[2] Government Department Newspaper Room handout.

[3] For which there were prerequisites.

[4] The person teaching this course completed the staff questionnaire but the students taking GT701 were not asked to complete the student questionnaire.

independently and another senior tutor was joint co-ordinator of a post-graduate course.

1.4 The Students

The students taking Government subjects ranged from school leavers to mature part-time students, many of whom were experienced public servants enrolled for such post-graduate subjects as Formulation of Public Policy and Administrative Theory. Some students included a number of Government subjects in their work towards an Arts degree and a few proceeded to Honours work. Some of these were vocationally motivated and hoped to join, for example, the Diplomatic Service. The Faculty of Law required students proceeding towards a Bachelor's degree to take either History or Government subjects, so the primary interest of some students taking Government subjects was the Law. For others a Government subject was chosen as an elective towards credit in a degree either from preference or faute-de-mieux.

1.5 Methodology

It was hoped to use the investigation of the way the Department of Government used the University's library resources not only to elicit objective information but also as a means of developing attitudes and behaviour which the author believed would contribute to the improvement of teaching and learning in the University of Queensland. More particularly, the author hoped to use the six months spent working with the Tertiary Education Institute and the Department of Government to:

- stimulate a reappraisal by both academic and Library staff of their objectives in what they offered to and expected from students
- facilitate a better understanding by each of the contribution of the other to teaching and learning
- establish more effective communication between academic and Library staff and
- ensure the efficient use of Library resources.

The data was collected and analysed with as much objectivity as possible and always with the recognition that it applied specifically only to the first semester of 1976. The author was frankly participant as well as observer. Thus, before she subjected the behaviour of the Department of Government staff and students to close scrutiny, she acted as helper and informant and as one who would do all she could to "improve" that behaviour before she examined it. While the findings of a pure research kind of investigation would be more readily accepted as applicable to the teaching of Government subjects in other semesters and to subjects other than Government subjects, there were strong arguments for the more constructive approach of a research-and-development, rather than of a pure research kind.

The author had met most of the staff of the Department before requesting permission to undertake the study and was known to most of them personally, as Undergraduate Librarian or as President of the Academic Staff Association. Permission to undertake the study was given formally at a meeting of the academic staff of the Department and individual members gave time and attention to various aspects of data collection and interpretation whenever they were requested to do so. The author visited the Department frequently and members must have been more than usually aware of matters relating to the Library. In fact, one member commented: "One needs to be reminded, from time to time, of the important role played by the Library in academic study and to this end, the aims of the study are useful and worthwhile." Another member of staff, recently-arrived in the Department, expressed scepticism about what the study could achieve. Nevertheless, within a short time of his arrival, he had established a mutually helpful relationship with members of the Library staff with, undoubtedly, a useful "spin-off" for the students taking his subjects.

The Library was mentioned in some way at all introductory sessions with classes which the author, the lecturer or a member of TEDI staff recorded on tape as part of this study. However, there is no evidence as to whether this semester differed from others in this respect. Because a librarian was frequently within sight and hearing, information about the needs and attitudes of Government staff and about Library services and difficulties was easily exchanged. Informal arrangements were also made for advice to be given to some classes on how to begin finding material for particular assignments.

Three questions were of primary interest in this study: what learning and teaching materials do the staff and students of the Government Department need, how many of them do they find in the Library and what do they do if they cannot find what they look for? Answers to these questions raise ancillary questions about how genuine and/or legitimate some needs are, how carefully needs are formulated, how efficient are literature and library searches, and what are the consequences to individuals and to the University when library resources are inadequate to meet accepted objectives or unreal expectations.

Behind these questions are broad and basic issues of methods and approaches to teaching and learning, but direct concern with these was outside the scope of this enquiry. For Library staff the culmination of this series of questions is the Reference Librarian's interview with an individual user which seeks to take into account the purpose for which the material is sought, the level and amount of material required, the resources of one library or a network of libraries, time needed to procure the information and, in a university library, the amount of help needed to ensure that the user is familiar with the bibliographic tools which are the keys to the literature.

The responses to the staff questionnaire were analysed against a background of information obtained from exploratory

interviews, attendance at classes and informal discussions, and the 587 effective responses to the questionnaire prepared for students were analysed by computer. It was beyond the scope of this study to report in detail on the individual relationships with the Library of each member of the total sample of twenty-one staff and about 1,000 students. The compromise between the belief that the substance of the Library's contribution to teaching and learning lies in individual relationships and a study that seemed capable of achievement, was to design the questionnaires as far as possible around the subjects offered by the Government Department.

During interviews with three members of staff, chosen mainly because they happened to be available in early February, questions about their objectives in teaching Government subjects, about their assumptions about and expectations of, students and the Library, and about the respective responsibilities of staff and students, were explored. These were pilot interviews, the main purpose of which was to help generate productive questions for the subsequent questionnaire.

Subject outlines and reading lists were collected. Some were available early in February while others were duplicated just in time for classes during the first week of semester. These were studied before the questionnaire for students was formulated and re-examined in the light of some of the responses.

The first contact of every lecturer and tutor with one of his or her classes in each subject was recorded to find out what the students were told about the objectives of the course, what was said about learning materials, and Library resources in particular, whether Library services were mentioned and in general to get the "feeling" of the class. Sometimes the author was invited formally to speak to the class, sometimes she participated in the discussion or spoke to students informally before and after the class.

The questionnaire prepared for staff was in four parts, "Subject planning and the Library", "Using the Library", "Communication with students" and "General". Separate answers to some questions were required in respect of each of the two or three subjects taught by the respondent.

In the first section a series of questions was asked about when major decisions on content and way of teaching were made, when course outlines and reading lists were drafted, when copies of the reading lists were sent to the Library, and whether the respondent had been contacted by the Readers' Adviser in the Undergraduate Library who was responsible for meeting the Library needs of students taking Government subjects.

The second section enquired generally about how staff used the Library for teaching and research. It included questions on how staff find references to the information they seek and what they do when particular items are not available in the Library the first time they look for them. It was also hoped to relate frequency

of "seeking" to frequency of success, but the questions were not specific enough to yield any "hard" information.

In the third part as in other parts of the questionnaire, the questions were not, and were not intended to be, mutually exclusive and this made neat statistical analysis difficult. These questions sought information about what staff expected from the Library, how they expected students to use the Library, what staff intended when they gave information about references to students and how they expected students to use the information the staff referred them to.

The fourth section invited self-assessment about the way staff taught and gave information about Library materials, about Library resources and the ability of students to use the Library.

This, and the questionnaire prepared for students, were designed not only to seek information but also to make respondents aware of resources about which they might not have known and of possible courses of action which they might not have otherwise contemplated. As one student commented in his answers to the questionnaire, "[I] had no idea that some of these services were available."

The questionnaire for students asked about the way they were given information about books and periodical articles, which libraries they used, and how successful they were in finding material for Government subjects. Also if they were not successful they were asked to whom they turned for help and whether they had had any form of instruction in using the Library.

Most of the questions were about use of the Library for Government subjects generally but some, concerning references to books and periodical articles given by lecturers, were related to specific subjects. It was assumed that students are sometimes unnecessarily vexed and frustrated in using the Library because they do not understand how a lecturer intends them to use these references and that academic staff would be interested to find out how their intentions had been perceived by their students. The format of the student questionnaire was influenced by the decision, made at the time of drafting, to analyse the responses by computer. While some questions were directed to students taking particular subjects, questions about the time students had spend "at a university" were included to allow differentiation, if required, between students for whom it was their first year at a university and students for whom it was a second or later year. Were the latter more sophisticated in their approach to the Government subjects they were studying and in their use of the Library?

The questionnaires were distributed personally to staff members early in April when it was assumed that staff would still find it easy to recall the times when they had made major decisions about their courses. Most students were given time to complete the questionnaires when they were handed out in class, some before, and

some after the mid-semester break in May. By that time most students would have been exposed to the advisory programme produced by the Library and have completed, or begun, work on an essay or tutorial paper.

2.0 ACADEMIC STAFF AND THE LIBRARY

2.1 Introduction

It was hoped to trace patterns of Library use both generally within the Government Department and for academics individually. Certain generalizations can be made from the evidence available; for instance, that most academics used lists of books and periodical articles to guide the reading of their students but few of them told the Library staff before February about what they expected their students to read. Most of the academics in the Government Department expected their students to have certain Library skills, but fewer than half of them took steps to ensure that they did. There was no discernible connection between the way an individual academic used the Library himself and his expectations about the way his students would use it.

Twenty-one effective questionnaires were received from the 21 members of the Government Department teaching at the beginning of the first semester of 1976. The data from these questionnaires are presented under the headings used in the questionnaire but in a different order.

2.2 Use of the Library by Staff

2.2.1 Libraries Visited

TABLE 1

Number of Times Staff Visited Various Libraries

Library	about once a week	about once a month	about once a semester	hardly ever	no reply [5]
Central Library	15	5			1
Undergraduate Library	3	9			9
other University libraries*	2	1	5	3	10
other libraries**			1	4	16

[5] 'No reply' may mean that the question was overlooked or was regarded as inapplicable but it is a more likely assumption that 'no reply' in this and later tables means 'no' or 'none' or 'never'.

* The other University libraries visited were: Thatcher Memorial Library, Fryer Library, which houses the research collection of Australiana, the Law Library and the Music/Architecture Library, which houses material on regional and urban planning.

** One respondent used the library of the Australian Development Commission.

Comment: The deliberately neutral term "visited" was chosen because it was difficult to establish an inclusive, yet precise, meaning for the possibly alternative term, "use".

Staff visited the Central Library more frequently than any of the other Libraries on the campus or than other libraries outside the University.

2.2.2 Frequency of Seeking Information

TABLE 2

Frequency of Seeking in the Library Information in Relation to the Subjects Taught

	about once a week	about once a month	about once a semester	hardly ever	no. of subjects offered
undergraduate subjects	4	10	4	6	16
honours and post-graduate subjects	2	2	6	5	12

Comment: The categories in the tables showing frequency of use were intended to focus attention on patterns of behaviour. However, some respondents could not accommodate their frequency of use to the categories in the tables because it was irregular, often depending on the needs of their research from time to time. The frequencies shown in the tables should be read with this qualification. The adequacy of a respondent's personal library, the extent of prior preparation to teach a subject or previous experience in doing so, and, more generally, familiarity with the subject matter, would all affect the frequency with which subject-related material was sought in the Library. Furthermore, some confusion was apparent in subsequent conversations about the meaning of the term "information" as in "frequency of seeking information in the Library in relation to...". It was intended to mean any kind of approach to the literature or audio-visual presentations within fields of interest and not necessarily specific facts. Misunderstanding might have resulted in the responses indicating a lower frequency of "seeking" than actually occurred.

TABLE 3

Frequency of Seeking Information in the Library for Other Purposes

	about once a week	about once a month	about once a semester	hardly ever	no reply
other teaching and research interests	8	7	3	2	1
other needs and interests		5	1	3	12

Comment: The greater frequency of seeking information for other teaching and research interests, compared with the seeking of information in relation to the subjects the respondents were teaching (Table 2) is not unexpected, given the probability that respondents were pursuing less familiar and less elementary material and also the qualifications expressed about the accuracy of Table 2.

2.2.3 Use of Bibliographic Tools

TABLE 4

Frequency of Use of Bibliographic Tools

Information Source	about once a week	about once a month	about once a semester	hardly ever	no reply
library catalogue	13	4	1	1	2
select bibliographies	3	4	11	1	2
book reviews	5	12	2	1	1
citations to known material	6	6	5		4
periodical indexes	2	5	7	5	2
abstracting journals	2	2	8	6	3
other bibliographic services		2	5	7	7
colleagues within the University	2	4	9	4	2
experts outside the University		1	9	7	4
other				3	18

Note: Under "other" but not indicated in the frequency classification were library accession lists, when available,[6] and publishers' advance lists.

Comment: The Library catalogue, book reviews and citations to known material were the most frequently used sources of references to information followed by select bibliographies, periodical indexes and colleagues within the University.[7]

2.2.4 Success in Finding Information

All efforts to obtain information were successful for 16 subjects, sometimes successful for 15 subjects and rarely successful for one post-graduate subject. Only two respondents said they were always successful in obtaining information in relation to their other teaching and research interests and 13 respondents were sometimes successful. Eight respondents were sometimes successful when they tried to obtain material for needs and interests other than teaching and research and two respondents were rarely successful. This limited success rate is discussed on page 67. Staff were also asked what they did when their initial efforts to find information failed. Their responses are summarised in the following table.

TABLE 5

Frequency of Taking Alternative Courses of Action After Initial Lack of Success

Alternative	No.of staff using alternative				
	about once a week	about once a month	about once a semester	hardly ever	no reply
ask the Library staff for help		9	7	2	3
request an inter-library loan			8	9	4
borrow from elsewhere	1	3	8	3	6
find substitute material	1	5	9	2	4
recommend purchase by Library	1	4	10	3	3
purchase by staff member	1	8	7	4	1

[6] Distribution of accession lists had lately been discontinued.

[7] For further discussion of the frequency of use of bibliographic tools see page 66.

Comment: The alternatives given in this question were not mutually exclusive. This question was intended to explore the reaction of staff who went to the Library for a particular title or literature on a certain subject but who failed to find it at the first attempt; and also whether the usual channels for further search were used and if so how often. The phrase "cannot find in the Library" used in the questionnaire was open to a number of interpretations. For example, that the user could not find an entry in the author/title catalogue because the form of entry for a government publication or a publication by a corporate body was difficult to establish. On the other hand, the respondent might not have been able to find the item because it had never been acquired, or having been acquired, had been subsequently lost.[8]

2.2.5 Contacts with Library Staff

Library Staff Contacted by Academic Staff for Help in Finding Information or about Difficulties involving Library Procedures

There were 48 graduate professional librarians on the Library staff. Ten respondents named, as people from whom they would seek assistance (in finding information or about difficulties involving library procedures), ten of the graduate professional librarians and two members of the staff of Library Audio-Visual Services.

Sixteen respondents found Library staff, in general, helpful and three found them moderately helpful. Two did not answer this question.

Comment: Questions about how "helpful" academic staff had found Library staff were intended to find out whether Library staff had made available to academic staff useful information or material, but some comments suggest "helpful" was more loosely interpreted as "friendly and courteous". Discussion of interaction between Library staff and academic staff may be found on page 68.

2.3 Subject Planning and the Library

2.3.1 Information for the Library

Of nine respondents who had by August 1975 made at least one of the major decisions, that is, as to the content of the course or the way it was to be taught, four had sent lists to the Library in December 1975, one in January 1976, and four in February or later. Four people who made decisions later than August 1975 also sent lists in December, February or later. The earlier start in course planning was not generally followed by early advice to the Library staff. However, one person who had made major decisions about content by

---

[8] For further discussion of these alternative courses of action see page 67.

December also advised the Readers' Adviser in the Undergraduate Library in December, although major decisions about the way he would teach and the drafting of course outlines were not finished until January and February respectively. Reading lists then were drafted "ad hoc" and the first of these sent to the Library in February.

No one had advised the Library about material needed for the first semester of 1976 by September 1975. Yet that was effectively the deadline and advice received after that date allowed insufficient time for efficient planning and preparation.

Comment: It was assumed that academic staff used the reading lists they prepared for students to inform Library staff about material their students would need for the coming semester. Other ways of conveying this information were not included in the questionnaire with the result that, in general, academic staff who did not prepare reading lists did not answer this question.

An interesting piece of information to emerge from the answers to this series of questions was that seven respondents had taken all major decisions about the way they would teach ten subjects before they had made the major decisions about what they would teach.

2.3.2 Contact with Readers' Adviser

Only three Government Department staff said they had not been contacted by the Readers' Adviser for Government subjects about their courses for first semester 1976 either in writing, by telephone or in person. Two were teaching post-graduate and diploma courses with classes of no more than eight students, whose needs would reasonably be met by the combined resources of the Central Library and the Undergraduate Library without the detailed preparation needed for large classes and the other held a temporary appointment made just before the beginning of the semester. Contact with this person was made early in March.

Fourteen teachers knew before this semester that the Readers' Advisers needed information about their subjects early in the long vacation if the material required was to be ready for students by the beginning of the first semester. One of these had not realised the importance of early notification and subsequently explained to his students that he had been dilatory in not telling the Library staff about what was needed for his course. Six teachers did not know that information was needed early. Of these two had newly arrived in the department, two were teachers of small post-graduate classes mentioned above and one did not specify required reading for his class of 50 students who had a wide choice of topics and were expected, as part of the course, to find their own sources.

Comment: The importance of effective communication between the lecturers and the Readers' Advisers in the Undergraduate Library is discussed on page 54 ff.

2.3.3 Staff Expectations about Library Holdings

TABLE 6

Percentages of Material in Undergraduate and Post-graduate Subjects Staff Expect the Library to Hold

Percentage of material	Number of undergraduate subjects	Number of post-graduate subjects
about 90%	14	8
about 75-90%	2	2
about 50-75%	1	2
less than 50%	0	0

Comment: The reality of some of these expectations is discussed on pages 62 & 63 in relation to specific subjects, and, generally, on pp. 35ff in relation to students' assessment of how successful they were in finding Library material for Government subjects.

A further question asked about the basis for these expectations.

TABLE 7

Basis for Expectations That Subject Material Was Held by the Library

Basis for Expectation	Number of undergraduate subjects	Number of post-graduate subjects
inspection of the Library's shelves	11	8
inspection of the Library's records	14	10
advice from Library staff	5	3
reports from students	6	7
previous experience	12	8

Note: A number of respondents based their expectations on more than one of these alternatives.

Comment: The basis for expectation most frequently given was inspection of the Library's records. Given a rate of about 5 to 6 percent loss of books relevant to Government subjects, the most efficient way of assessing the Library's holdings for a specific subject is an inspection of the shelves during vacations when most of the material should have been returned.[9] One respondent gave as an additional reason for his expectation, the fact that he had recommended the purchase of specific items needed for his subject.[10]

2.4 Communication with Students

The first questions under this general heading of "Communication with Students" are concerned with reading lists.

2.4.1 Reading Lists

TABLE 8

Reading Lists Provided for Students

	Lists given	No Lists given	No. of subjects offered
undergraduate subjects	12	4	16
Honours post-graduate subjects	7	5	12

Comment: The undergraduate subjects for which no lists were prepared were the subject for independent study and the three subjects discussed in detail on pages 50ff. For six undergraduate subjects and two post-graduate subjects it was planned to distribute lists additional to the initial reading lists. A general discussion of the way in which reading lists were used may be found on pages 49ff.

---

[9] An inspection of the shelves for this purpose might also remind the lecturer of books, held in multiple copies, relevant to his subject which he might then recommend to students.

[10] Material which lecturers recommend for purchase by the Undergraduate Library is sometimes not received until after the students' need for it has passed, sometimes not available because it is out of print and sometimes not ordered because the funds for that subject are exhausted.

2.4.2 Purposes of Reading Lists

TABLE 9

Purposes for Which Reading Lists Were Used

Purpose	Number of undergraduate subjects	Number of post-graduate subjects
specify required reading	8	4
give wide coverage of the literature	9	0
suggest relevant material	5	5

Note: These purposes were not mutually exclusive.

Comment: Some respondents said that their lists indicated both required reading and relevant material even when the lists contained without explanation 20 or more book titles as well as a number of periodical articles. Another said that a list with no apparent differentiation between items was intended to specify required reading, give a wide coverage of the literature and suggest relevant material. Some respondents who used lists did not answer the above question (Table 9) nor the following one.

TABLE 10

Information (Other Than Bibliographical Details) Intended by Lecturer to be Gained by Students from Reading Lists

Information	Number of undergraduate subjects	Number of post-graduate subjects
lecturer's view of the relative importance of the items	11	6
the comparative difficulty of the items	3	4
the time by which the items should be read	3	1
the order in which the items should be read	4	2

Comment: Some respondents used the space provided for the specification of information other than the kinds listed, to say that the answers they had given to this question did not apply to the lists per se, but that students would learn all these things in other ways, for example, from class discussion. One respondent said that students should learn to "appreciate the width, etc. of course and relevant material available" and another, "the purpose which the books would serve, e.g. background, preliminary, special interest in particular topic, mainline, essential out of the books listed in a group under a particular heading."

2.4.3 Staff Response to Students' Inability to Find Material

TABLE 11

Response to Staff to the Inability of Various Proportions of Students to Obtain Material on Reading Lists

	No. of staff who would take the action listed if - of students were unable to obtain material					
	5%	10%	20%	35%	50%	more than 50%
modify the course		1	2		2	5
modify tutorial topics		4	4	2		1
modify essay topics	1	3	6			
obtain material from other sources	1	2	1	2	1	
provide a list of alternative titles	4	2	4	1	1	
suggest students look for alternative titles	6	4	2			1
discuss the problem with the Library staff	1	4	5	2	1	
do nothing	5					

Note: Some respondents indicated that they would follow more than one course of action.

Comment: Respondents were asked what they would do if a proportion of their students were unable to obtain material for their subjects. In the questionnaire a range of proportions and a variety of possible

actions were listed, but there was no opportunity to take into account either the importance of specific items or the amount of material which students were unable to find. Five respondents did not answer the question or answered with a note instead of encircling the numbers indicating various choices of action. Some made the point that with proper planning there should always be sufficient material. However, within the last few years when student numbers for certain courses had increased substantially and unpredictably, proper planning was not always possible (this comment also overlooks the difficulty of predicting how many students will choose a particular essay or tutorial topic from a list of topics). Some staff said they had already covered two of the options, that is, they had provided a list of alternative titles and had suggested that students look for alternative titles. The experience of the author shows that small classes for which the Library was more or less adequate were not likely to encounter this difficulty.

2.4.4 References Given during the Course

TABLE 12

How References Which Arise During the Course Were Given by Staff to Students

	No. of staff taking following frequency of action				
	always	sometimes	rarely	never	no reply
mentioned in class	15	4			2
written on board	8	4	2	2	5
duplicated handouts given	2	11	3	1	4
individual students advised	4	10		1	6

Note: Some respondents gave references in more than one way.

Comment: References which arose during the course were most frequently given to students by the lecturer mentioning them in class. Students' reaction to references given in this way is discussed on page 43ff.

TABLE 13

Guidance to Students on the Reading of a Reference Given to Class

Action	Frequency				
	always	sometimes	rarely	never	no reply
lecturer's view of the relative importance given	16	4			1
whether to read in part or whole indicated	12	4	1		4

Note: Some respondents indicated that they did both these things.

Comment: One respondent, as well as doing both these things, also suggested "what is rubbish and what is not". Similar questions were asked about references given on reading lists. They were all designed to examine the extent to which lecturers deliberately make clear to their students their expectations of how students should use these references.[11]

TABLE 14

Staff Expectations of Action by Students When References Were Mentioned in Class and/or Written on the Board

Action to be taken by students	No. of staff expecting action by -					
	all students	most students	some students	few students	no students	no reply
to note them accurately	10	5	3	1		2
to try to find them in the Library	4	6	6	1		4
to tell the teacher if they cannot find them	8	4	5	3		1

Note: Some respondents expected their students to do all of these things.

[11] Students certainly come to conclusions, justifiably or otherwise, about the importance lecturers attach to specific references.

Comment: Only one respondent used the "other" category in this question. He said he expected a few students to "demand highly specialized bibliographies on highly obscure topics".[12] More respondents expected all or most students to note these references accurately than expected all or most students to try to find them in the Library.

2.4.5 Staff Expectations about Students' Library Skills

TABLE 15

Staff Expectations of What Students Should Find Out About Using the Library

	No.of staff believing the following proportions of students should have the library skills listed					
	all	most	some	few	none	no reply
use the subject catalogue	19	2				
use one or more periodical indexes	9	4	6	2		
find periodical articles in the general collection of the Library*	14	5	1			1
find audio-visual material	4	1	4	4	6	2
find Government publications	7	2	3	4	2	3

Note: *Some respondents answered this part of the question by saying they expected their students to find xeroxed copies of periodical articles prepared by the Library for specific subjects.

Comment: As respondents were asked about their expectations of students in their subjects, these replies would be more meaningful if they were read with respect to specific subjects, for example, the lecturer in Political Theory from Plato to Machiavelli did not expect students to know how to find government publications for his subject. On the other hand, some respondents were apparently not aware of the range and variety of audio-visual material at tertiary level held in the Library relevant to Government subjects as they are taught in the University of Queensland. Only one of 11 respondents who taught both undergraduate and post-graduate or honours subjects differentiated in the reply between these two levels of subject with respect to students' library skills. This raises

[12] These students might have been motivated to learn to use some of the more sophisticated bibliographic tools to find information about the "obscure" topics and one hopes that the Library staff would be asked to teach such students to do so.

an important question as to what extent staff have different expectations of, or otherwise treat differently, students at different stages in their University courses.

2.4.6 Instruction in Using the Library

TABLE 16

Instruction in Some Aspect of Library Use Arranged by Academic Staff for Students Taking their Subject

Instruction arranged	Number of undergraduate subjects	Number of post-graduate subjects
instruction by Library staff	4	3
instruction by lecturer	7	2

Comment: For 11 undergraduate and five postgraduate subjects out of the 28 subjects taught in the Department of Government, some form of instruction in using the Library was arranged. Five respondents did not answer this question, two implied that the students in their advanced subjects did not need any instruction and one said instruction for his class was arranged during his absence. Two said they always mentioned the name of the Readers' Adviser and one of these always made his students write it down. Another said he expected his students "to know how to use a library before coming up to university, otherwise to use their initiative to find out how to do so". Of the ten respondents who made arrangements for instruction, one used a slide/tape programme designed to help first level students write their first assignments made by a member of staff seconded to TEDI [13] and the Readers' Adviser for Government subjects, six asked Library staff to speak to their classes and seven gave instruction themselves (four of these 'six' and 'seven' did both).

2.4.7 Staff Response to Students with Library Problems

[13] A member of staff from the Department of History.

TABLE 17

Action Taken by Lecturers When One or More Students Had Library Problems in Relation to Their Subjects

Action taken	Number of undergraduate subjects	Number of postgraduate subjects
students referred to the Readers' Adviser for Government subjects	7	
students referred to other Readers' Advisers	2	
students referred to Reference Services	6	4
students referred to other members of the Library staff	4	1
the respondents solved the problem themselves	10	6
the respondents had not met any students with Library problems	4	4

Note: Some respondents took more than one of these actions

Comment: Without an understanding of the specific problems encountered, it is not possible to comment on the appropriateness or otherwise of the action taken. The kind of Library staff most likely to be able to offer help in finding information for specific courses is discussed on pages 52ff and the students' assessment of "success in finding" after help was received is discussed on page 40.

2.4.8 Extent of Satisfaction of Government Staff

TABLE 18

Satisfaction of Staff Concerning Various Aspects of Their Teaching of Government Subjects

Aspect	Degree of satisfaction concerning subjects taught			
	very satis-fied	satis-fied	a little dissatis-fied	dis-satisfied
the way I teach	6	15	15	
the way I give information about Library materials to students	4	19	8	3
the way I give information about learning materials other than Library materials to students		23	9	1
Library resources for my subjects	4	23	7	3
the ability of students to make efficient use of Library resources for my subjects	3	18	9	3

Note: Figures refer to subjects. Not all the respondents answered all parts of this question for all the subjects they taught. Some subjects were taught by more than one staff member.

Comment: These figures are unremarkable in that the majority of respondents are satisfaied with all aspects listed. There appears to be some correlation between the way respondents felt about (1) the way they gave information about Library material to their students and (2) the ability of those students to make efficient use of Library resources. However, this is not confirmed for specific subjects by an examination of individual responses to the questionnaire.

3.0 STUDENTS AND THE LIBRARY

3.1 Introduction and Basic Data

Enquiries were confined to the way students used the Library to find material for Government subjects, how successful they were, whether they asked for help when they had difficulty and how many had read or used the advisory material prepared by Library staff or had had any formal instruction in using the Library.

Most of the students used reading lists, in contradistinction to the bibliographic tools available in the Library, as starting points when they looked for material for Government subjects. Most of them had limited success in finding what they looked for and few of them asked for help. The effectiveness of advisory material, formal instruction in using the Library, or of the help given on request by Library staff is not conclusively demonstrated by this study.

Official statistics record 1,216 enrolments for the 28 Government subjects covered by this study. They do not record the total number of students enrolled in these subjects. These figures are dissected in Table 19 to give the number of enrolments for subjects at each level.

TABLE 19

Response Rate to Questionnaire Prepared for Students

Subjects	Number of enrolments, first semester 1976	Number of responses	Responses as % of enrolments
1st level	680	366	53.8
2nd level	422	263	62.3
3rd level	6	4	67.0
Honours IV	20	3	15.0
Post-graduate	88	39	44.3
Total	1,216	675	55.5

Note: Some students were enrolled for one, and some students for more than one subject. Effective questionnaires were returned by 587 students and covered an aggregate of 675 enrolments.

Factors thought to be significant for Library use were: the number of years a student had spent studying at a university, the level of the subject studied and the number of enrolments for each subject. In Table 20 subjects are grouped by code numbers to indicate

the number of enrolments for each subject. Levels one to three are shown by the first digit in the subject code number. For post-graduate subjects the first digit is "8".

TABLE 20

Distribution of Student Numbers in Government Subjects - First Semester 1976

More than 100	60-100	30-59	10-29	less than 10
GT100	GT200	GT109	GT111	GT380
GT105	GT204	GT212	GT209	GT802
		GT216	GT215	GT803
		GT233	GT223	GT812
		GT243	GT226	GT813
			GT242	GT830
			GTIVH	GT840
			GT820	GT845
			GT821	GT846
			GT835	

Answers to the question of whether in 1976 students were in their first or a later year of university study are summarised in the following Table.

TABLE 21

Number of Years Spent Studying at a University - Students in Government Subjects First Semester 1976

Year at a university	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents
First year	186	31.7
Second or later year	396	67.5
Did not answer	5	0.9

Note: Discrepancies are due to rounding.

3.2 Use of the Library by Students

3.2.1 Libraries Visited

TABLE 22

Percentages of Respondents Who Had Visited Various Libraries at Least Once During 1975 or before May 1976

Respondents	Central Library %	Under-Graduate Library %	Other University Libraries* %	Other Libraries %	Government Dept. Newspaper Room %
First year at a university n = 186	86.0	98.9	41.4	28.5	12.9
Second or later year at a university n = 396	(92.2)[14]	97.2	36.1	36.0	41.2
Total n = 582	90.2	(97.8)	37.8	33.7	32.1

Note: *The question was intended to cover University of Queensland Libraries, other than the Central and Undergraduate Libraries, but some respondents might have interpreted it to mean "the libraries of other universities".

Comment: More respondents had visited the Undergraduate Library than had visited the Central Library, but more later year students than first year students, had visited the Central Library. More than 85 per cent of both first and later year students knew of the existence and location of both Central and Undergraduate Libraries.[15] The other University libraries specified by students were: Architecture/ Music, Fryer, Law, Thatcher and Biological Sciences Libraries. Some students had also visited the small collections housed in the Philosophy and Economics Departments. The libraries students visited outside the campus were: the State Library, the Library of Griffith University, Oxley Memorial Library and the libraries of residential colleges, schools, colleges of advanced education, state and local governments, the Courier Mail, several industrial companies and the Brisbane municipal system.

3.2.2 Advisory Material Read or Used

[14] Throughout this Report figures of particular interest have been encircled.

[15] There have been indications during each year since the establishment of the Undergraduate Library in 1973 that a number of students did not know that they could use both Central and Undergraduate Libraries.

TABLE 23

Percentages of Respondents Who Had Read or Used Advisory Material of Various Libraries During 1975 or Before May, 1976

Respondents	Printed brochures and leaflets about services offered by:			A-V programmes available in:		
	Central Library %	UG Library %	Other Branch Libraries %	Central Library %	UG Library %	Other Branch Libraries %
First year at a university n = 186	65.1	83.9	21.0	12.4	30.6	0.5
Second or later year n = 396	54.8	68.7	9.8	11.4	24.2	0.8
Total n = 582	58.1	73.5	13.4	11.7	26.3	0.7

Comment: Brochures and leaflets explaining the services offered by the Library and how to use the classification system and the catalogue are displayed in all of the University's Libraries and the audio-visual programmes are listed in the printed material. The use of this material, and the effect of formal instruction in using the Library on the success respondents had in finding information for Government subjects are discussed on pages 61ff.

3.2.3 Formal Instruction in Using the Library

TABLE 24

Percentage of Respondents Who Had Formal Instruction in Using the Library During 1975 or Before May, 1976

Respondents	Orientation programmes	Lectures in Central Library	Tutorials in UG Library	Individual instruction		Visit to lecture etc. by Library Staff	Substantial part of lecture etc. devoted to using Library
				Central	UG		
First year n = 186	27.4	7.5	(30.6)	5.4	15.1	11.8	17.7
Second or later year n = 396	13.9	3.8	15.7	11.4	16.7	(38.1)	15.7
Total n = 582	18.2	4.9	20.4	9.5	16.2	29.7	16.3

Comment: It is not known how many students were reached by only one, or by more than one, form of reader education nor how many had experienced none of these forms during 1975 and up to May 1976.

More first year than later year students attended tutorials in the Undergraduate Library; more later year than first year students attended a lecture visited by a member of the Library staff.

Orientation programmes, such as displays and voluntary lectures and tours of the Library, have not been classified as formal instruction.[16]

The tutorials in the Undergraduate Library were arranged with particular members of the academic staff so that there was some pressure on students to attend, and visits by Library staff to lectures and tutorials were always by invitation.

Individual instruction may be given in the Library when the initial request for help and subsequent discussion suggest that the student either does not know how to use the Library generally or is willing to learn to use specific bibliographic tools. The Readers' Advisers in the Undergraduate Library regard this contact with individual students as an important part of their teaching in the University.

Some of the respondents who said that a substantial part of a Government lecture or tutorial had been devoted to using the Library, included the showing of a slide/tape programme.[17]

---

[16] Lectures on general aspects of Library use were not given by the Library staff as part of the orientation programme in 1976 because attendance in 1975 had been very small.

[17] See page 33.

3.2.4 Where Students Looked for Material

TABLE 25

Percentages of Respondents Who Had Looked for Material for Government Subjects in Various Libraries

Libraries	First year respondents n = 186 %	Later year respondents n = 396 %	Total respondents n = 582 %
Central Library	69.9	78.8	75.9
UG Library	98.9	91.2	93.6
Other University libraries	7.5	14.4	12.2
Libraries outside University	21.5	29.8	27.1
Government Dept. Newspaper Room	9.7	30.3	23.7

Comment: Less than ten percent of respondents had not looked for material for Government subjects in the Undergraduate Library during the first semester of 1976 by May, when they completed the questionnaire.

3.2.5 Use of Bibliographic Tools

TABLE 26

Percentages of Respondents Using Various Bibliographic Tools as Starting Points for Finding Library Material for Government Subjects

Bibliographic tools	First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
Reading lists:			
Most of the time*	56.9	55.0	55.6
Often	22.1	18.7	20.0
Less than half the time	21.1	26.3	24.4
Bibliographies to encyclopaedia articles:			
Most of the time	1.8**	3.4	2.9
Often	2.5	2.8	2.7
Less than half the time	95.7	93.8	94.5
Subject catalogues in University Libraries:			
Most of the time	21.3	20.7	20.9
Often	13.8	14.5	14.4
Less than half the time	65.0	64.8	64.8
Periodical Indexes:			
Most of the time	7.8	11.6	10.3
Often	7.2	5.7	6.2
Less than half the time	84.9	82.7	83.5
Select bibliographies:			
Most of the time	9.4	8.0	8.7
Often	3.1	7.0	5.7
Less than half the time	87.4	85.0	85.6
Other reference tools:			
Most of the time	1.2**	3.9	3.0
Often	1.9	2.9	2.6
Less than half the time	96.8	93.1	94.3
Footnotes to material already found or known:			
Most of the time	7.9	11.0	10.2
Often	6.1	11.0	9.3
Less than half the time	86.0	78.0	80.5

* More than 75% is categorised as "Most of the time"
50 - 75% "Often"
Less than 50% "Less than half the time"

** The number of respondents is less than 50.

Comment: More than 50 percent of the respondents used reading lists as a starting point for finding most of the material they used for Government subjects and the difference between first and later year students was marginal in this respect. Both groups of students used the subject catalogue to much the same extent but later year students found more material by starting from periodical indexes than first year students did.

3.2.6 Difficulty in Finding Material for Government Subjects

TABLE 27

Percentages of Respondents Who Had Difficulty Finding Library Materials for Government Subjects During First Semester, 1976

Respondents	Never %	Up to five times %	More than five times %
First Year n = 183	10.9	52.5	36.6
Later Year n = 385	13.3	58.7	28.1
Total n = 568	12.5	56.7	30.8

Comment: The relationships between "difficulty in finding" and experience of the various forms of reader education are set out in Table 32 and discussed on page 40.

3.2.7 Help Requested

TABLE 28

Percentages of Respondents Who Requested Help When They Had Difficulty in Finding Library Material for Government Subjects

Help requested from		First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
In Central Library:				
Reference Staff	Yes	14.1	29.6	24.7
	Sometimes	24.1	19.1	21.4
	No	61.8	50.4	54.0
Other staff	Yes	6.6	7.8	7.4
	Sometimes	9.2	15.2	13.1
	No	84.2	77.0	79.5
In UG Library				
Readers' Advisers	Yes	28.2	26.3	26.9
	Sometimes	22.4	24.6	23.8
	No	49.4	49.1	49.3
Other staff	Yes	7.8	9.8	9.1
	Sometimes	16.2	13.9	14.7
	No	76.0	76.3	76.2
Outside the Library				
Government Dept. staff	Yes	5.9	10.3	8.8
	Sometimes	10.5	10.0	10.1
	No	83.6	79.7	81.1
Other	Yes	9.2	5.9	7.0
	Sometimes		2.5	1.4
	No	90.8	91.6	92.0

Note: A five-point scale was used:

always	often	sometimes	hardly ever	never
1	2	3	4	5

In the above table, always, often = yes
sometimes = sometimes
hardly ever, never = no

Comment: Nearly half the respondents who had difficulty finding material for Government subjects hardly ever or never asked for help. First year students were more reluctant than later year students to ask for help when they had difficulty in the Central Library but there is only a marginal difference between the figures for the two groups when they had difficulty in the Undergraduate Library.

The reluctance of students to approach the staff of the Government Department for help with Library problems is reflected in these figures as it is in Table 40. The kinds of Library staff best able to help students with specific problems and whether students are able to distinguish between one kind of Library staff and another are discussed on page 64.

3.2.8 Success in Finding Material for Government Subjects

TABLE 29

Percentages of Respondents Successful in Finding Material For Government Subjects in Various Libraries

Libraries	First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
Central Library			
High success*	28.4	36.6	34.2
Moderate	38.8	28.8	31.5
Low success	32.8	34.6	34.3
UG Library			
High success	53.6	45.3	48.0
Moderate	28.7	33.5	31.7
Low success	17.7	21.2	20.3
Other University libraries			
High success	52.6**	53.5	53.2
Moderate	10.5	29.3	24.1
Low success	36.8	17.2	22.8
Other libraries			
High success	38.6**	58.4	53.3
Moderate	27.3	18.4	20.7
Low success	34.1	23.2	26.0
Government Dept. Newspaper Room			
High success	72.2**	54.2	56.9
Moderate	11.1	21.2	19.7
Low success	16.7	24.6	23.4

Note: *A five-point scale was used: Very successful 1 2 3 4 5 Not successful

In the above table 1,2 = High success
3 = Moderate
4,5 = Low success

** The number of respondents was less than 50

Comment: The percentage of respondents who had looked for material for Government subjects in other University libraries, in libraries outside the University and in the Government Department Newspaper Room, was much smaller than the percentage who had looked in the Central Library or in the Undergraduate Library, but their success in finding material was higher. It may be that fewer students competed for the material or that students usually went to other libraries when they were looking for a specific item known to be held there.[18]

A score was devised by which students' success in finding material in the University's Libraries could be compared subject by subject, and it was applied to eight Government subjects with enrolments of 30 or more. The differences were small. On a scale from 4.0 meaning 'always successful' to 0.0 meaning 'never successful', the range was from 2.9 (for GT212) to 2.1 (for GT204) for the eight subjects, and the subjects with the largest enrolments, GT100 and GT105, scored 2.2 and 2.6 respectively. The needs for Library material arising from specific subjects and the success of students in finding material for those subjects is discussed on pages 62ff.

3.2.9 The Influence of Reader Education on Success

The only instruction in using the Library that the majority of respondents had received was in the form of the brochures and leaflets prepared by the Library staff in the Central and Undergraduate Libraries. Students who had read these were more likely to be successful in finding material than those who had not. This was also so for the smaller number of students who had used the audio-visual material available in these Libraries. Students who had attended a lecture or tutorial in the Government Department substantially devoted to some aspect of Library use or had attended tutorials in the Undergraduate Library were marginally more successful than those who had not. The following tables include only a small selection of all the figures available. They show some of the reader education devices used by the largest numbers of students and also some of the largest differences between those who had been exposed to certain advisory materials and those who had not.

---

[18] One respondent went to libraries other than the University Library which was 'too big and confusing' and another said that the State Library and one of the municipal libraries were the 'best of all as far as assistance is concerned'.

TABLE 30

Percentages of Respondents Successful in Finding Material for Government Subjects in Central Library According to Their Exposure to Various Advisory Materials about Libraries

Whether read brochures about Central Library	Successful 1-2 %	3 %	Not successful 4-5 %	Did not look %
First year:				
Yes n = 119	22.7	30.3	26.1	21.0
No n = 60	18.3	25.0	21.6	35.0
Later year:				
Yes n = 212	34.4	29.2	23.1	13.2
No n = 153	20.9	14.4	35.3	29.4
Whether read brochures about UG Library	**Successful 1-2 %**	**3 %**	**Not successful 4-5 %**	**Did not look %**
First year:				
Yes n = 153	21.6	28.1	22.2	28.1
No n = 29	17.2	31.0	34.5	17.2
Later year:				
Yes n = 262	29.8	24.0	27.5	18.7
No n = 111	27.0	20.7	30.6	21.6
Whether used A-V material available in Central Library	**Successful 1-2 %**	**3 %**	**Not successful 4-5 %**	**Did not look %**
First year:				
Yes n = 23	47.8	21.7	26.1	4.3
No n = 143	16.8	29.4	23.8	30.1
Later year:				
Yes n = 44	34.1	38.6	25.0	2.3
No n = 295	28.5	19.0	29.2	23.4
Whether used A-V material available in UG Library	**Successful 1-2 %**	**3 %**	**Not successful 4-5 %**	**Did not look %**
First year:				
Yes n = 57	29.8	24.6	21.1	24.6
No n = 112	17.9	30.4	25.0	26.8
Later year:				
Yes n = 93	31.2	24.7	21.7	22.5
No n = 257	29.6	20.2	30.4	19.8

TABLE 31

Percentages of Respondents Successful in Finding Material for Government Subjects in the Undergraduate Library According to Their Exposure to Various Advisory Materials about Libraries

Whether attended tutorials in UG Library	Successful 1-2 %	3 %	Not successful 4-5 %	Did not look %
First year:				
Yes n = 57	59.6	26.3	14.0	
No n = 119	50.4	29.4	18.5	1.7
Later year:				
Yes n = 59	44.1	39.0	15.3	1.7
No n = 290	42.1	30.0	19.7	8.3
Whether read brochures about UG Library	**Successful 1-2 %**	**3 %**	**Not successful 4-5 %**	**Did not look %**
First year:				
Yes n = 153	55.5	28.1	16.3	
No n = 30	40.0	30.0	23.3	6.7
Later year:				
Yes n = 268	47.0	31.3	18.7	3.0
No n = 108	29.6	30.6	23.1	16.7
Whether used A-V material available in UG Library	**Successful 1-2 %**	**3 %**	**Not successful 4-5 %**	**Did not look %**
First year:				
Yes n = 56	58.9	19.6	21.4	
No n = 112	53.6	31.3	13.4	1.8
Later year:				
Yes n = 94	51.1	28.7	16.0	4.3
No n = 256	40.2	30.9	20.7	8.2
Whether read brochures about Central Library	**Successful 1-2 %**	**3 %**	**Not successful 4-5 %**	**Did not look %**
First year:				
Yes n = 119	58.0	26.1	16.0	
No n = 60	43.3	35.0	18.3	3.3
Later year:				
Yes n = 209	47.4	31.1	15.8	5.7
No n = 156	34.0	31.4	26.3	8.3

Further evidence is available on the same issue from students' answers to questions about the difficulty they had in finding Library materials. The same selection of reader education devices as before is included in the following Table.

TABLE 32

Overall Difficulty Students Had in Finding Library Material for Government Subjects According to Their Exposure to Various Advisory Materials

Whether read brochures about Central Library	Never had difficulty %	Had difficulty up to 5 times %	Had difficulty more than 5 times %
First year:			
Yes n = 119	11.8	50.4	37.8
No n = 61	9.8	54.1	36.1
Later year:			
Yes n = 210	15.2	52.9	31.9
No n = 155	10.3	64.5	25.1
Whether read brochures about UG Library	**Never had difficulty %**	**Had difficulty up to 5 times %**	**Had difficulty more than 5 times %**
First year:			
Yes n = 153	11.8	52.3	36.0
No n = 30	6.7	53.3	40.0
Later year:			
Yes n = 263	11.8	59.3	28.9
No n = 112	17.0	56.3	26.8
Whether used A-V material available in Central Library	**Never had difficulty %**	**Had difficulty up to 5 times %**	**Had difficulty more than 5 times %**
First year:			
Yes n = 23	8.7	43.5	47.8
No n = 143	11.9	53.9	34.3
Later year:			
Yes n = 43	20.9	46.5	32.6
No n = 295	12.9	59.3	27.8
Whether used A-V material available in UG Library	**Never had difficulty %**	**Had difficulty up to 5 times %**	**Had difficulty more than 5 times %**
First year:			
Yes n = 57	7.0	50.9	42.1
No n = 112	13.4	52.7	33.9
Later year:			
Yes n = 94	11.7	63.8	24.5
No n = 255	14.9	56.9	28.2

Comment: The figures here are inconclusive, and indeed sometimes indicate that students who have had some kind of reader education report more difficulty than those who have not. There are some possible explanations of this. One would be that an unknown proportion of those who present themselves for reader education are the more inefficient, more insecure, among the student body who, even after help, still think themselves incompetent; whereas some at least of those who claim to have had little or no difficulty even though they had no reader education are the confident types. Without knowing how competent (as far as library skills are concerned) individual students were before they received library instruction, we can venture no judgement as to whether their confidence, or lack of it, is justified. The point was made in 'Students, Lecturers and Librarians' that students are often very unwilling to admit to any deficiencies in their Library skills.[19]

Further discussion of the effectiveness of formal instruction in Library use in reducing students' difficulty in finding library material will be found on page 64.

The following Table summarises the extent of students' success in finding material after they had received help from any source - from Reference staff, Readers' Advisers, or other Library or Government Department staff:

TABLE 33

Percentages of Respondents Successful in Finding Material for Government Subjects After They Had Received Help

Respondents	Always %	Often %	Sometimes %	Hardly ever %	Never %
First year n = 147	9.5	36.7	34.7	12.2	6.8
Later year n = 304	14.1	37.8	32.9	8.6	6.6
Total n = 454	12.6	37.4	33.7	9.7	6.6

Note: Total includes respondents who did not say whether 1976 was their first or later year at a university.

Comment: Later year students were a little more likely to find material after they had received help than were first year students. However, these figures might reflect the adequacy of the collection to meet needs arising from specific subjects rather than the quality of the help given or the ability of individual students to make use of it.

[19] Roe, E. and Biggs, S. Students, Lecturers and Librarians: A Study of Some Problems of Communication. Tertiary Education Institute, January 1975, p.20.

3.3 Information Given to Students

How useful was the information students received about 'what to read'? In the following Tables are data concerning some individual Government subjects:

3.3.1 Reading Lists

TABLE 34

Opinions of Respondents Taking Selected Government Subjects About the Helpfulness of Reading Lists in Making Their Decisions About What to Read up to May, First Semester, 1976

Subject	Very helpful 1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Not helpful 5 %	Not handed out %
GT100 n = 233	49.4	24.9	18.0	5.6	0.9	1.3
GT105 n = 115	40.0	31.3	15.7	8.7	2.6	1.7
GT200 n = 39	28.2	41.0	20.5	5.1	5.1	
GT204 n = 53	22.6	30.2	34.0	9.4	1.9	1.9
GT212 n = 28	57.1	32.1	7.1	3.6		
GT216 n = 29	48.3	31.0	17.2	6.9		3.4
GT233 n = 27	51.9	18.5	22.2	7.4		
GT243 n = 32	6.3	25.0	9.4	3.1	6.3	50.0

Note: The subjects selected had enrolments of 30 or more students. Reading lists were handed out for all these subjects except GT243.

Comment: Most respondents found the reading lists helpful. Compare these figures with those in Table 26, which shows the percentage of respondents who used reading lists as a starting point for finding material for Government subjects.

The next Table gives some indication of what, rightly or wrongly, students thought their lecturers expected them to do with those lists:

TABLE 35

Percentages of Respondents Taking Selected Government Subjects Who Thought the Lecturer Expected Them to Read Various References Given in Reading Lists at the Beginning of First Semester, 1976

Subject	All of them	Some of them	Those the lecturer marked as of special importance	Any the respondent chose	Respondent did not know	Respondent said no references were given
	%	%	%	%	%	%
GT100 n = 233	2.6	26.6	21.9	42.5	5.6	0.9
GT105 n = 117	6.0	42.7	7.7	30.0	13.7	
GT200 n = 40	0.5	35.0	12.5	45.0	2.5	
GT204 n = 53	11.3	33.9	28.3	22.6	1.9	1.9
GT212 n = 28	3.6	39.3	32.1	21.4		3.6
GT216 n = 31	3.2	54.8	22.6	16.1		3.2
GT233 n = 27	3.7	59.3	7.4	29.6		
GT243 n = 33	12.1	45.5	9.1	6.1	6.1	21.2

Note: The subjects selected had enrolments of 30 or more students. Reading lists were handed out for all subjects except GT243.

Comment: Respondents might have had difficulty distinguishing between two categories, "some of them" and "any you chose or thought useful". There is clearly some confusion amongst respondents about what the lecturer intended and the diversity of their interpretations is wide. Figures such as those in Tables 34 and 35 should be of considerable interest to individual lecturers and should assist them to make their own assessment of the effectivness with which their intentions were communicated to their students.

3.3.2 References Given in Class

The following Tables show something of students' reactions to references given during lectures or tutorials:

TABLE 36

Percentages of Respondents Noting References Given in Class

References given in class	Whether noted	First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
Given orally:				
To or from books	Yes	66.7	74.6	71.9
	Sometimes	24.0	18.8	20.5
	No	9.3	6.6	7.6
To or from periodicals	Yes	52.5	64.8	60.8
	Sometimes	29.0	25.5	31.8
	No	18.5	9.7	12.4
Written on board:				
To or from books	Yes	85.1	84.5	84.8
	Sometimes	10.1	12.3	11.5
	No	4.8	3.2	3.7
To or from periodicals	Yes	71.1	79.1	76.7
	Sometimes	14.8	15.2	15.0
	No	14.1	5.6	8.4

Note: A five point scale was used:

Always	Often	Sometimes	Hardly ever	Never
1	2	3	4	5

In the above Table, Always, Often = Yes
Sometimes = Sometimes
Hardly ever, Never = No

Comment: There was little difference between the number of first and later year respondents who always or often noted references to books whether they were given orally in class or written on the board but considerably more later year than first year students noted references to periodicals when they were given orally. Both groups of students were more likely to note references when they were written on the board than when they were given orally.

TABLE 37

Percentages of the References Noted in Class That Respondents Looked For

References looked for	First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
More than 75%	12.5	21.8	18.8
50-75%	18.5	22.6	21.3
25-50%	21.2	20.8	20.9
Less than 25%	47.8	34.7	38.9
No. saying no references given	2 out of 186 students	9 out of 389 students	11 out of 579 students

Comment: Later year students were more likely to look for references given in class than first year students.

TABLE 38

Percentages of the References That They Looked For That Respondents Found

References found	First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
More than 75%	22.7	29.6	27.3
50-75%	17.2	22.9	21.3
25-50%	20.2	19.4	19.7
Less than 25%	39.9	28.1	31.6
No. who did not look for references	23 out of 186 students	42 out of 387 students	65 out of 577 students

Comment: Later year students were marginally more successful than first year students in finding the material referred to in class.

TABLE 39

Percentage of Respondents Who Found the Information Given in Class Adequate for Finding the References

Respondents	Always adequate %	Often adequate %	Sometimes adequate %	Hardly ever adequate %	Never adequate %
First year n = 156	16.7	40.4	34.0	7.1	1.9
Later year n = 354	20.5	48.2	25.1	3.8	2.3
Total n = 502	19.1	46.0	27.9	4.8	2.2

Comment: Again, later year students were marginally more successful than first year students. Even if some variation in the quality of the bibliographical details given is assumed, later year students appear to be more likely than first year students to note them accurately and to use the notes they had made efficiently when they looked for the references in the Library.

TABLE 40

Percentages of Respondents Taking Various Actions When Information for Finding References Was Inadequate

Course of Action		First year respondents %	Later year respondents %	Total respondents %
Checked with lecturer:	Yes	4.3	8.4	7.3
	Sometimes	5.0	13.2	10.5
	No	90.6	78.4	82.3
Checked with another student:	Yes	17.1	15.0	16.1
	Sometimes	43.2	28.2	33.3
	No	39.7	56.1	50.6
Problem solved by self in library:	Yes	56.5	59.7	58.7
	Sometimes	25.3	22.0	23.0
	No	18.1	18.2	18.2
Problem solved with help of Library staff:	Yes	14.5	21.7	19.5
	Sometimes	25.5	22.4	23.3
	No	60.0	55.9	57.2
Other:	Yes	3.3	4.0	3.8
	Sometimes	1.1	1.1	1.1
	No	95.6	94.9	95.1

Note: A five point scale was used:

Always	Often	Sometimes	Hardly ever	Never
1	2	3	4	5

In the above Table, Always, Often = Yes
Sometimes = Sometimes
Hardly ever, Never = No

Comment: Both first and later year students were most likely to solve for themselves in the Library any problems arising from inadequate references. First year students were marginally more likely to ask another student for help than were later year students, and later year students marginally more likely than first year students to ask Library staff for help. However, later year students appear to be less reluctant to approach the lecturer about inadequate references than first year students.

In the following Table are figures for some individual Government subjects about the helpfulness of references given in class.

TABLE 41

Opinions of Respondents Taking Selected Government Subjects About the Helpfulness of References Given Orally in Class in Making Their Decisions About What to Read up to May, First Semester, 1976

Subject	Very helpful 1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Not helpful 5 %	Not given %
GT100 n = 229	19.7	20.1	25.3	22.3	8.7	3.9
GT105 n = 113	15.9	26.6	24.8	14.2	17.7	0.9
GT200 n = 39	17.9	15.4	43.6	10.3	10.3	2.6
GT204 n = 51	11.8	33.3	19.6	13.7	9.8	11.8
GT212 n = 26	3.8	26.9	26.9	7.7	15.4	19.2
GT216 n = 31	25.8	16.1	32.3	16.1		9.7
GT233 n = 27	11.1	18.5	29.6	11.1	3.7	25.9
GT243 n = 32	15.6	18.8	37.5	15.6	9.4	3.1

Note: The subjects selected had enrolments of 30 or more students.

Comment: It is not possible to establish by checking with the staff questionnaire, whether or not any references actually were given orally in class. The question directed to staff about references given orally in class was about the usual practice of the staff member, not about what they did for specific subjects during the first semester of 1976.

3.3.3 Individual Staff-Student Discussions.

The final Table concerning specific Government subjects refers to individual discussions between staff and students:

TABLE 42

Opinions of Respondents Taking Selected Government Subjects About the Helpfulness of Discussions Individually With the Members of the Government Department They Approached in Deciding What to Read up to May, First Semester, 1976

Subject	Very helpful 1 %	2 %	3 %	4 %	Not helpful 5 %	No discussion %
GT100 n = 226	15.5	8.0	4.0	5.3	2.7	64.6
GT105 n = 111	13.5	9.9	4.5	6.3	6.3	59.5
GT200 n = 39	23.1	10.3	10.3	2.6		53.8
GT204 n = 49	8.2	12.2	10.2	2.0		67.3
GT212 n = 25	20.0	24.0	4.0	4.0		48.0
GT216 n = 29	20.7	24.1	13.8	3.4		37.9
GT233 n = 30	6.7	10.0	16.7			66.7
GT243 n = 33	30.3	18.2	18.2	15.2	3.0	15.2

Comment: This Table reflects the reluctance of students to approach the academic staff as shown (a) in Table 40, which sets out the percentages of respondents taking various courses of action when the information they had noted in class was inadequate for finding material in the Library and (b) in Table 28, which sets out the percentages of respondents requesting help from various sources when they had difficulty finding Library material for Government subjects.

4.0 THE GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT'S USE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

4.1 Teaching Objectives

Most of the members of the Government Department in the University of Queensland during the first semester of 1976, supported, in one way or another, the idea that one of the objectives of university teaching was to encourage students to be impartial in their analysis of data and to think critically about information and ideas.[20] One talked about "critical sophistication" and another warned students against being so partisan in their study of politics that they would not be able to see any merit on the other side. "Any certainties you now hold should be subject to question". Some hoped that the study of aspects of particular governments would provide students with the bases from which the activities of other governments could be understood and others hoped to stimulate a lasting interest in the subject. "The aims of the course are set out in the handout. I hope you will become interested in local government." Some lecturers seemed to accept that some of their students were taking the courses with the main objective of accumulating credit points, but one said unequivocally, "I want to give my students tools for research." Some lecturers thought the contribution of the Library was in providing some of the raw materials for study to be carried out by students and as a source of materials, interesting in themselves, which would provide ideas for intelligent reflection. In general, the staff of the Government Department believed that academics have a responsibility to improve their grasp of their subjects and in this way improve their teaching, which is inextricably linked with the subject materials. The use of the Library for their own research appeared to be less important to them than its use for teaching because the nature of the research carried out by staff and post-graduate students required them to find much of their material outside the Library.

Towards the achievement of course objectives students were urged to read. Some staff emphasised the importance of the textbook, others expected students to buy certain titles or they distributed copies of articles in an effort to ensure that everyone did all the reading. Some lecturers said to their students "Go to the Library, soak yourselves in history. Some books are worth reading, some worth browsing" and "it's up to you to read and get around in the sources - whatever you decide the sources are." One staff member was highly critical of handouts which specify in detail what students should read, saying "spoonfeeding is not good for students".

---

[20] Some members differentiated between their aims in teaching and the aims of the subject. Some also hoped that the attitudes of enlightened students would influence the community beyond the campus.

4.2 The Use of Reading Lists

Duplicated reading lists were provided for most courses, both undergraduate and post-graduate (see Table 8). These lists ranged in length from more than 150 to less than ten items. Some were arranged in sections under headings indicating aspects of the subject or the form of the material such as books, periodicals or cassettes. The only indication of the level of the material listed was the occasional use of a heading to indicate introductory or preliminary reading. There were few annotations to indicate whether all or only some of the items should be read or whether the material listed was to be preferred to any the students might find for themselves. Some of the books on one list were marked with an asterisk to indicate that they were "so good that they could have been set as textbooks" and another list referred to the parts of the books to be read for specific purposes. However, in general, explanations about level of scholarship, difficulty and how the student should approach the material, e.g. superficial reading, browsing, or in-depth study, were given in class and so were not easily available to Library staff or to students who could not or did not attend when an explanation was given.[21] As one student commented, "The mere publication details of the books in the reading list were not really sufficient to convince one of their usefulness in studying the subjects", and another wrote, "It is always quicker to ask a student who does the same subject ... because they tell you which parts you need most in, say, a book where the lecturer or catalogue[22] only tells you the name of the book."

Some references were given with full bibliographical details, some with only the authors and titles of the items and one list included Library call numbers. All lists prepared for the first semester of 1976 were sufficiently detailed and accurate for students and Library staff to identify the items with little trouble.

Most of the duplicated reading lists given to Government students at the beginning of the first semester of 1976 did not clearly fulfil the purposes for which the academic staff said they had prepared them,nor convey to students the information the lecturers had intended them to convey. (See Tables 9 and 10). For example, although the lecturer who prepared the list with Library call numbers did not say so, it seems from other evidence that it was intended either to give a wide coverage of the literature or to suggest relevant material. Nevertheless the inclusion of Library call numbers implicitly emphasized the titles listed and might have discouraged students from using other relevant material. In the same way, a long list which purports to give wide coverage of the literature or to suggest (rather than stipulate) relevant material, but which does not explicitly say so, can lead to confusion for both Library staff and students.

Additional confusion sometimes arises from lack of a clearly defined purpose behind the preparation of each reading list. Library staff often use the reading lists prepared for students as de facto

---

21 There is no pressure on students to attend lectures.

22 This student was apparently referring to the author/title, and not to the subject, catalogue.

recommendations for the purchase of the items listed if they are not already in the Library. An efficient purchasing policy, particularly of multiple copies for student use, requires more information about anticipated use and relative importance of specific items than is contained in most of the lists.

In general students thought reading lists were helpful (See Table 34) and 55.6% of respondents used them as starting points for finding 75 per cent or more of the material they sought for Government subjects (See Table 26). For Library staff they are a mixed blessing because of the way students use them. Some students feel they should read, or photocopy, every item on the list even when this is not indicated and even when the list is a long one. Some are reluctant to use other appropriate material if it is not listed, even when listed material is not available when they need it. However, some students use the items on the lists as starting points in their search for relevant material which they find on the shelves around where listed material should be or they find appropriate subject-headings in the catalogue by looking at the tracing notes[23] at the bottom of the card bearing the entry under the name of the author of the listed item.

Reading lists prepared for students can be useful in subject planning. It is not however, clear from the responses to the questionnaire prepared for staff, from an examination of the lists themselves or from the actual requests from students in the Library, how the staff of the Government Department intended their lists to be used during the first semester of 1976.

4.3 Guiding Students' Reading in Three Undergraduate Subjects

The provision of reading lists has no inherent virtue either as a teaching method or as a means of alerting the Library to anticipated demand. Indeed, they might well be inappropriate for guiding the disciplined reading of small classes of post-graduate students. Such students might be expected to know how to find and evaluate material relevant to their individual purposes, and, provided that their field of study is adequately covered by the collection, the demands on the Library by these students for particular items should not cause the pressure which results when too many students need to use too few copies. The three undergraduate subjects for which there were no lists are worthy of closer examination.

Students in one were required to write a review of a book or an article on democratic theory. They were free to choose their own material for review but were given a list of about 100 suggested titles. The purpose of this handout was to set the assignment and students were expected to find their own background reading.[24]

---

[23] Tracing notes are annotations, for Library use, to show the subject headings used in other parts of the catalogue.

[24] Enrolment for this subject was 22.

For another subject,[25] the lecturer, who strongly disapproved of reading lists because he believed students should look for their own material, asked for a two-page outline of an essay with a draft bibliography to be presented at a tutorial session. The lecturer then commented on, and, if necessary, added to the draft bibliography. Each student had the advantage of the tutorial discussion before he wrote the essay and was assured that the sources he had consulted were adequate. In both subjects the essays formed part of the assessment, there was a very wide choice of topics and the lecturers expected 90 per cent of the material needed to be in the Library. The author showed the classes for these subjects a selection of appropriate bibliographic tools and in all classes about one third to one half of the students had known of one or more of the tools described. The first group of students, those who were required to write review essays, were shown by their replies to the questionnaire to be more successful than most other groups in finding material for their assignments and showed a higher success rate than most of the other classes analysed. All except six of the books listed for review were held by either the Central or the Undergraduate Libraries so every student should have been able to read a book suitable for the review assignment. However, when students enquired for some of these titles the Readers' Adviser[26] assumed, not having heard the explanations given in class, that the list of assignment titles was the kind of reading list usually provided for Government subjects. She brought those books, which were held in the Central Library, to the Undergraduate Library and made them available to students for two-hour loan periods. This action increased any difficulty students might have experienced in finding a book to review.

The second group of students, those who were expected to make a start to find their own materials, were also relatively successful in finding material for this subject and, given the very wide choice of topics and countries allowed for discussion, there should have been enough material in the periodical literature if not in monographs, for tutorial and assignment papers. Again the Readers' Adviser did not fully understand how the lecturer was teaching so she inappropriately pressed requests for reading lists when the lecturer had decided not to use them.

For the third of the undergraduate subjects[27] for which there were no reading lists, the titles of six books were listed in the Departmental Handbook, available to the Readers' Advisers as to students from January 1976. They were recent publications, which the lecturer said in class was one of the reasons given for studying them. At the first contact between the lecturer and the class, the availability of material was discussed. Five of the six titles were known to be in the bookshop and three in the Library.

---

25 Enrolment for this subject was 49.

26 The role of the Readers' Advisers in the Undergraduate Library is discussed on page 52.

27 The enrolment for this subject was 12.

The lecturer was prepared to lend his own copies to students who had real difficulty obtaining any of them and to allow students to read his newspapers in his office. He hoped students would read all the titles but expected them to read two for tutorial papers and essays. The students raised the difficulty of finding periodical articles in the Library at the time they needed them. From the discussion it seemed that in the past the students had asked help from Library Assistants or Attendants who did not have the qualifications and experience to give them effective advice. The names of three members of the Reference staff were given to the students with the suggestion that they would help them find, if not the article they were looking for, other articles which would help them acquire a background to, and widen their understanding of, the books they read for this course. This proposal was accepted by the lecturer. These students were also relatively successful in finding material.

In these three subjects it is clear that reading lists per se were irrelevant and that both lecturers and students knew or should have known how books and periodicals were to be used. There was sufficient range and depth in the Library collection to support these subjects - provided the students knew how to use the appropriate bibliographic tools to find relevant material. The way these lecturers expected their students to use the Library's resources made use of a wide range of material, instead of concentrating demand on specific items, but the success of this method depended on effective three-way communication between lecturer, Readers' Adviser and students and on students knowing how to use the subject catalogue, several periodical indexes and Book Review Digest.

4.4 The Undergraduate Library in the University of Queensland Library System

Before attempting to explore the sequence of major decisions made by lecturers about the subjects they taught and the advice they gave about them to the Library, a little more should be said about the place of the Undergraduate Library within the Library system of the University of Queensland.

The collection, as well as the service, is directed to the needs of students taking certain subjects in the Humanities and Social Sciences and, as subjects change, irrelevant and outdated items are discarded. Professional librarians, known as Readers' Advisers, try to establish and maintain communication with the academic staff in the hope of finding out, in time to order and prepare for use, what library material academic staff will be recommending to their students during the coming semester. As well as the conventional records of the collection prepared by the technical service departments of the Central Library, each Readers' Adviser makes an ephemeral record about each subject as it is being taught during that semester. A substantial part of that record consists of the study guides, assignment topics and reading lists prepared by the academic staff for students and annotated by the Readers' Adviser. In an ideal situation, each Readers' Adviser knows before the students know, the topics set for tutorial papers and essays, the dates by which they are to be handed in, the "key" books and periodical articles for each assignment, the amount of other relevant material in the collection and the bibliographic tools which lead to it and

whether (or to what extent) the lecturer expects students to read only what he has recommended or whether (or to what extent) he expects students to explore the literature for themselves. Ideally, too, the lecturer will see that students are given this information and will refer them to the Readers' Adviser if they have difficulty finding particular items or enough library material to complete the work to be done. Together the lecturer and the Readers' Adviser will suggest substitute material, revise reading lists and try to ensure that each student has the skills to use the Library and the confidence to ask for help, when he needs it.

In the Undergraduate Library, as elsewhere, the ideal is not always achieved. Even when Library staff have been able to obtain lists in time to order material not held[28] and arrange loan periods for the material already in the Library, they seldom hear about changes in courses or revisions to lists until, and unless, students come to them with problems. Lists given to students are rarely altered even when lecturers are told that certain titles are not available. Many lecturers expect students to find for themselves substitute material, while many students lack the confidence to depart from the lists and the library skills to exploit the available literature.

4.5 Subject Planning and the Library

4.5.1 Advance Information Sent to the Library

It is probably naive to look for a simple sequential relationship between (i) the taking of major decisions about the content of the subject and about the way it is to be taught and (ii) the sending of information about Library materials to the appropriate Readers' Adviser in the Undergraduate Library. As one staff member pointed out, "In working out an approach to questions one gets caught up with the materials" and another said he adjusted the list to "what is available in the Library". Nevertheless the interrelationship should be formalized and the Readers' Adviser told about the materials at least six months before students are expected to ask for them. When the use of library materials is an integral part of a course, unless they are available to students, the course must fall short of its objectives at least to that extent. As has been argued in Students, Lecturers and Librarians[29] academic staff "should adjust

---

[28] The average time between ordering and accessioning:

Location of supplier	1975
England	151 days
USA	155 days
Holland	140 days
Germany	146 days
Australia	100 days

(University of Queensland, Library. Report of the University Librarian for 1975.)

[29] Roe, E. and Biggs, S. Students, Lecturers and Librarians: A Study of Some Problems of Communication. Tertiary Education Institute, January 1975, p.19.

their expectations to accord with the realities of the situation as far as availability of books is concerned, instead of continuing to hold the same expectations and carry out the same procedures as if they had made lists available six months in advance."

Most of the respondents who sent lists to the Readers' Adviser, or otherwise informed her of the library materials needed for the subject, did so in February, 1976 whilst none of them did so before December, 1975. By reference to the average time between ordering and accessioning Library material as set out in footnote 28, it will be seen that even December, 1975, was too late for efficient planning for the first semester of 1976. In that case all first semester Government subjects should have been based on the existing Library collection. Even so, if all the lecturers had waited until February, 1976 to inform the Readers' Adviser about what Library materials they expected their students to use, there would not have been time to organize the collection to meet student needs before they started work on their tutorial papers and essays.

4.5.2 Communication Between the Readers' Adviser and the Staff

In explaining the place of the Undergraduate Library earlier it was said that the Readers' Advisers are expected to establish and maintain contact with those teaching staff for whose subjects they are responsible. One lecturer said, "I expect library staff to do all the work related to obtaining information about courses, students' needs and students' problems and needs re Library and books". Nevertheless he said he had contacted the Readers' Adviser [30]. Three respondents said they had not been contacted by the Readers' Adviser since November 1975 about their subjects for the first semester in 1976.[31] One of them did not move into the Department until the beginning of the academic year. She was contacted by the author during this study and the Readers' Adviser informed of her arrival. As a result of this, a good relationship was established and Library planning for the second semester was undertaken in good time. Her comment was "I have never had the experience as an internal teacher[32] of the library contacting me to enquire about the needs of a particular course, explain time scale of library requirements, etc." The other two taught small classes of post-graduate students.

Of the five academics who did not know, when they answered the questionnaire, that the Readers' Adviser needed information about their subjects early in the long vacation, two, who were newly arrived in the Department quickly established contact with the Readers' Adviser.

Two with small classes of post-graduate students said they did not know and the Readers' Adviser had not pressed for information about these courses. In retrospect, it would seem useful for the Readers' Adviser, as an important contact between the teaching department and the Library, to be informed of the requirements of

---

[30] A reading list had been sent to the Readers' Adviser in February by a tutor assisting in the teaching of this subject.

[31] Not all those respondents contacted by the Readers' Adviser sent reading lists, or otherwise told her about subject plans, before February or later.

[32] This academic had taught in the Department of External Studies.

even such small courses.[33] The other respondent who did not know now understands, as a result of this study, what help he can expect from a Readers' Adviser who has been informed of his teaching objectives and methods. A number of students from his class did ask for help from the Readers' Adviser. The help given might have been more effective had she been informed in advance about the content of the subject and method of teaching. Careful forward planning is important if a high quality service is to be given to members of a mass clientele.

When Reference Librarians give bibliographic assistance to a Library user who is known to them, contact can be made again when a "good lead" or further source of information emerges, as it often does, some time after an initial request has been made. This is not the case with the more anonymous members of a large student community. The most effective help is often given to the second or third student in a particular class who asks for it. If the Readers' Adviser knows for example, that students in a class are expected to find their own sources, some preparatory work can be done so that the first student who asks can be given effective bibliographic leads without delay. It seems pointless to blunt a student's enthusiasm for seeking information by unnecessarily withholding the reward of success especially during the early years at a university. Expectations aroused by the successful use of bibliographic tools in undergraduate studies could carry over to the pursuit of scholarly research in later years and in addition serve the personal and community purposes of the well-rounded graduate. The author does not believe there is any educational value in searching for Library material and not finding it.[34]

4.5.3 Staff Expectations About Library Holdings in Their Subjects

The expectations of most of the staff that 90% or more of the material on their reading lists, or needed for their subjects, would be held in the Library[35] was thought by the Readers' Adviser to be justified in terms of titles, but in practice there were not enough copies of some titles to meet demand from classes with large enrolments. The basis for staff expectations most frequently found in the responses to the questionnaires[36] prepared for staff, was inspection of the Library's records, although the Library's shelves were inspected, in addition or alternatively, for 19 out of the 28 subjects covered by this study. A check of the Library's catalogue establishes only that the title is or was held in the Library. The Readers' Adviser also checks to see whether the number of copies held is likely to meet anticipated demand. Nevertheless, some members of the Government Department know well, not only the titles but also the content, of the books the Library holds relevant to the subjects they teach and the number of copies of "key" titles.

---

33 The Undergraduate Library is misnamed. It is also responsible for certain course-work Masters degrees and post-graduate diploma courses.

34 For further discussion of this point, see page 61.

35 See Table 6

36 See Table 7

Most lecturers were prepared to modify tutorial and essay topics if students were unable to find Library material - some even to modify the course if the proportion of students was high enough[37] and Readers' Advisers are expected to take full advantage of this flexibility. However, during the first semester of 1976, although the Readers' Adviser for Government subjects always advised the appropriate lecturer when a specific title was not available, there was no indication that this information was passed on to the students. Anxious requests for the book frequently continued and the Library was not able to meet them.

4.6 Communication About Library Materials Between Academic Staff and Their Students

4.6.1 Reading Lists and References Given in Class

The importance of reading lists in the communication about Library materials between most members of the Government Department and their students during the first semester of 1976 has already been discussed.

Most of the staff also mentioned references orally in class as they arose during the course.[38] Not as many wrote them on the board, although both first[39] and later year students were more likely to take down references for books and periodicals if they were written on the board than if they were given orally.[40] The proportion of students who noted such references for books was higher than those who noted references for periodical articles given in this way. This might have been due to the comparative complexity of periodical references or because students did not know how to look for periodicals in the Library.

Most staff expected all or most students to note such references accurately but had lower expectations that students would look for them.[41] Later year students were more likely to look for such references than first year students, but more than half the students in both categories looked for fewer than 50% of the references they noted. Again, later year students were more likely to find those they looked for than were first year students. More than half the students found fewer than 50% of the references they looked for.[42]

---

[37] See Table 11

[38] See Table 12

[39] Students for whom 1976 was their first year at a university

[40] See Table 36: A study of seven institutions by Ernest Roe showed that only 39.6% of the references given by lecturers were taken down by students. Roe, E. Using and Misusing the Materials for Teaching and Learning. Canberra: ANU, 1975 p. 38.

[41] See Table 14

[42] See Tables 37 and 38.

Although correlation of the expectations of individual staff with the behaviour of their students in these respects would be more significant than these generalised statements, enough has been said to suggest that lecturers should look again at what they hope to achieve when they give references orally in class. The lower success rate for first year students in finding the references they looked for might well reflect the competition for scarce resources likely in classes with large enrolments as much as behaviour patterns or library skills. Later year students were more likely than first year students to have noted information adequate for finding the material[43] and more likely to check with the lecturer if the information was inadequate. Twelve lecturers expected all or most students to do so,[44] but students gave this as the action they were least likely to take. They were more likely to solve the problems themselves in the Library and, less frequently, to solve them with the help of another student or of Library staff.[45]

4.6.2 Staff Expectations About Use of the Library by Students

All the staff expected all or most students to find out how to use the subject catalogue and, with one exception, they expected all or most students to find periodical articles in the general collection in the Library. Fewer than half the staff expected students to find out how to use one or more periodical indexes, revealing an apparent inconsistency between this expectation and their expectation that all or most students should find out how to find periodical articles in the general collection of the Library.[46] For students in 16 out of 28 subjects, the staff said they had arranged for some form of instruction in using the Library. Reader education is discussed on pages 58ff.

4.7 Use of the Library by Students

4.7.1 Libraries Visited

One student commented, "After six years the Library and its systems are still one of the hidden mysteries of life to me". Another said, "I would not attempt to find anything in the Central Library because when ever I have looked before, it has never been there. The Central Library SCARES me".

Nevertheless more than 95 per cent of the respondents had visited the Undergraduate Library during 1975 or before May, 1976 and about 85 per cent had visited both Central and Undergraduate Libraries during that period.[47] About 93 per cent of respondents had looked for material for Government subjects in the Undergraduate Library and 75 per cent in the Central Library.[48]

---

[43] See Tables 38 and 39.

[44] See Table 14.

[45] See Table 40.

[46] See Table 15. Most of the staff would expect students to find copies of the periodical articles included in their reading lists. Multiple copies of these are made, they are listed in the Library by author and title and filed in a subject-related sequence. Finding these articles is a very unsophisticated way of using the Library.

[47] See Table 22.

[48] See Table 25.

4.7.2 Advisory Material and Formal Instruction in Using the Library

Advisory material about the Library's services is prepared by the Library staff and displayed in all the University's Libraries. Printed leaflets are prepared by the Reader Education Librarian on where to find and how to use the various parts of the collection. In addition some branch libraries prepare leaflets directed towards users of those specialized collections. The Undergraduate Library publicizes the names of the Readers' Advisers, together with the subjects for which they are responsible, and emphasises the importance to students when they cannot find what they need of asking Readers' Advisers for help. The special features of this Library are explained, such as the xeroxed copies of the periodical articles which appear on reading lists, and the borrowing regulations which are designed to ensure a quick turnover of material. Students are encouraged to use a programme, in audio-tape and booklet form, which provides a general introduction to, and instruction on using, the Undergraduate Library. Other similar programmes on finding material for a range of topics are also available. Library staff attend, at the request of academic staff, lectures and tutorial classes to talk about using the Library and also conduct classes in the Library.

Of all the respondents, 73.5 per cent had read the brochures and leaflets about services offered by the Undergraduate Library and 58.1 per cent had read the brochures and leaflets about services offered in the Central Library. The percentages of respondents who had used the audio-visual programmes in either of these Libraries was substantially lower than those who had read the brochures and leaflets.[49]

About 30 per cent of students for whom 1976 was their first year at a university had been to a tutorial in the Undergraduate Library and about 38 per cent of students for whom 1976 was a second or later year at a university had attended a lecture or tutorial which had been visited by a member of the Library staff.[50]

It was not possible to find out which students had experienced more than one of these forms of reader education or whether the later year students continued to improve their library skills to meet needs arising from higher level subjects. Nor is there any evidence that students knew that there are systematic ways of searching for information. Indeed, the following comments are indications to the contrary: "Brochures in Undergraduate Library of some use - best way to find way around Library is by looking around in a spare hour or so"; "I just get some call numbers, go to the shelves and then look in general at all available books. This is often more useful and

---

[49] 11.7 per cent of respondents had used the a-v programmes available in Central Library and 26.3 per cent had used those available in the Undergraduate Library (See Table 23).

[50] See Table 24

fruitful than searching for specific books and articles"; and "Maybe I'll learn by this semester's mistakes". On the other hand some students would have liked more instruction about using the Library than they received. In answer to a question a student wrote, "I would have liked to use Library facilities but they seem too complex and too time-consuming in trying to work them out. I don't understand the system used in the library at all. Yes, I'd like a lecture on it. I did not know where help was most available."

Students come to a university with differing degrees of skill in using library resources and some are bored when they are being instructed in something they already know or believe to be irrelevant. On the other hand, one student commented, "I've had no formal instruction and only found out about indexes too late." It is most important that instruction in using the Library is given at a time and in such a way that students can see that it is useful and directly relevant to their current purposes.

4.7.3 Use of Bibliographic Tools

It would appear from the number of Government subjects for which reading lists were provided by academic staff to give a wide coverage of the literature or suggest relevant reading, that they did not expect their students to have, or to develop, more than elementary skills in using the Library. Seventy-nine per cent of first year students and 73 per cent of later year students found at least half of the material they used for Government subjects by starting from reading lists.[51]

The later year students were more likely than the first year students to find material by starting from a range of other bibliographic sources. However, in spite of the apparently intensive use of the subject catalogue in the Undergraduate Library and the eagerness with which some students use periodical indexes when they are introduced to them by Readers' Advisers, these basic bibliographic tools are not, in general, exploited to their advantage by Government students. Only 21.3 per cent of 186 first year respondents and 20.7 per cent of 396 later year respondents found three quarters, or more, of the material they used by starting from the Library catalogue. About 19 per cent found a similar amount of material by starting from footnotes to known material, 16 per cent from periodical indexes and 14 per cent from select bibliographies.

These figures lead to speculation about the 80 per cent or more of students who found little, if any, of the material they used by starting from these recognised bibliographic tools. Were they reluctant to depart from reading lists even when the items listed were not available when they needed them and in spite of the fact that, for 19 courses, lecturers said the lists were intended only to give a wide coverage of the literature on the subject and/or suggest relevant material? How many students knew how to use these tools efficiently, especially those students who complained that they could not find information or discussion about specific topics? Were the items referred to in footnotes, indexes or subject catalogue not held by the Library, or, if held, not found by the students? Was the material found, not what the reference had led the searcher to believe it would be?

---

[51] See Table 26

Those academic staff who believe that reading lists of the kind described above are educationally unsound and likely to result in an apparent shortage of some titles while acceptable alternatives remain, unused, on the Library shelves, should ensure that their students know how to use the bibliographic tools useful for finding Library material for the assignments they set. This point is illustrated by a student's comment, "It is much easier and more organised to approach assignments and tutorial papers in your own individual manner. Besides, if every student followed advisory material, there would not be enough fish and loaves to feed the multitudes." According to a student taking a second level subject, "The Readers' Adviser in UG, especially if you find the one handling Government ... is able to direct you to various journal indexes ... Probably due to the nature of my essay, I found many references and so my bibliography and the library's resources were adequate."

Comparison of the use of basic bibliographic tools by first and later year students shows that there is little difference between the two groups in their use, as starting points for finding material, of reading lists, bibliographies to encyclopaedia articles, the subject catalogue, select bibliographies and footnotes to material already known or found. However, only 9.6 per cent of first year students started from periodical indexes for more than half the material they found for Government subjects while the percentage of later year students starting from periodical indexes was 17.3 per cent. Periodical articles are used extensively for some first level subjects with large enrolments. References are given on reading lists and multiple copies of the articles are held in the Undergraduate Library. This might be the only practical way for these students to use the periodical literature but the provision of multiple copies makes it unnecessary for students to use periodical indexes and thus they may never acquire the necessary skills.

Two comments by two different students provide an appropriate focus for discussion in this section. One is, "Success depends on knowing what it is you're after and thus giving people a definite guide" and the other, "I seldom requested help because I was often very vague about what I was looking for." In finding Library material directly relevant to the writing of tutorial papers and essays for Government subjects, it might well be difficult to know what to look for until one knows what one wants and, at the same time, one often doesn't know what one wants until one begins to look for it.

The process of finding material for Government subjects in the Library is an interaction between the student's understanding of the theory against which a specific topic is to be discussed, the (often very large) amount of information about the topic in general and the student's skill in choosing and using some of the material for his immediate purpose. If a student starts from say, one of the basic textbooks,he might follow the footnotes for an elaboration of some points and establish the terms used in writing about these points. Having established these terms he may then use them for further exploration of the literature through the subject catalogue and periodical indexes. During these explorations he will be making decisions about what is, or is not, suitable for his assignment and

in making these decisions,he will be defining his approach to it. Unless reading lists are carefully designed with a specific purpose in mind students' dependence on them might inhibit the development of appropriate searching strategies.

4.7.4 Success in Finding Material for Government Subjects

Any assessment of how successful students were in finding material for Government subjects must be related not only to search strategies, but to the adequacy of the Library's holdings to meet a range of demands which are influenced by the number of students enrolled and the kind of assignments set for each subject. Nevertheless, in general, more students believed they had been successful in finding material in the Undergraduate Library than in Central Library. This was to be expected as the collection of the Undergraduate Library is based on the known and anticipated needs of students in the larger Government classes, while the Central Library houses the general Humanities and Social Sciences collection. However, less than half the respondents rated themselves as very successful even in the Undergraduate Library.

The lack of success for students in the biggest of the first level subjects was evident from the comments made by students in this group and the Readers' Adviser was aware that there were not enough copies of certain "key" books. Leaving aside, for the time being, the question of whether students know how to use the Library efficiently, there are serious implications for the quality of teaching and learning of Government subjects in students' reported level of success in finding Library material.[52] Was the material students failed to find necessary for a proper understanding of, and developing competence in, the subjects they were studying? If it was, the quality of their learning must have been lowered by their failture. If it was not, the efforts of both the unsuccessful students and of the Library staff involved were misdirected and all were subjected to unnecessary frustration.

The respondents' assessment of their success in general is reflected in their assessment of their success in selected subjects.

4.7.5 The Influence of Reader Education on Success

The figures[53] taken from responses to the questionnaires are inconclusive in that students who had been given any form of instruction in using the Library were in general marginally more successful than those who had not. However, bearing in mind the various factors[54] which influence the success of a particular student in finding Library material for a particular subject at a particular time, the margins of success between one form and another or between first and later year students are not a significant guide to

---

52 See Table 29

53 See Tables 30 and 31

54 See discussion on page 62.

determining which of the alternative forms of instruction in using the Library (or indeed which combination of two or more forms) is most likely to improve success.

If students are to be taught how to find Library material for particular purposes, how to make systematic searches of the literature of particular subjects and are, in general, to be given experiences which will significantly increase the likelihood that they will find information when they need it, some important questions need to be answered: for example, when should such skills be taught, who is to teach them and how is the learning process to be made relevant to each student's intellectual development? Not enough systematic work has been done in reader education in the University of Queensland to resolve these questions, however Libraries must continue to try to inform their users about the services they offer. Any assessment of the quality of teaching and learning at tertiary level should include an assessment of the quality of Library resources as well as the contributions made by the professional Library staff. Librarians will no doubt continue to work with the belief that students in the Humanities and Social Sciences should be developing skills in using the Library during their studies and academic staff who share that belief will seek the help of Library staff in this aspect of their teaching.

4.7.6 Some Reasons For Lack of Success

Subject A

For a Government subject which included a study of the conservative parties in Australia, there was not enough material in the Library because little material covering recent developments in a systematic way had been written and published. A recent book on the Liberal Party of Australia, which was recommended by the lecturer, had not been purchased by the Library, when it was first published, in enough copies for first year classes because funds were not available in the appropriate account at that time. Less than two years after publication, this book was out of print and the Library had only one copy. Neither the academic nor Library staff recognised any other material as an adequate substitute for this title.

Action taken

The Readers' Adviser borrowed the single copy of the required book from the Central Library and lent it to students for periods of two hours during which the book could be read in the Undergraduate Library. This short loan period was inappropriate for a book which students were expected to read, not merely to consult or refer to. Steps were taken to obtain second hand copies for the next time the book would be required and, if necessary, the Library staff would seek the permission of the publisher to make copies of all or parts of it. The question remains whether the lecturer could have placed less emphasis on recent developments without substantially reducing the value of this university subject.

Subject B

One lecturer taught a first level subject by relating ideas and broad issues on which there was a great deal of material available,

in a way that was not reflected in the literature. Students were required to read parts of a substantial body of literature which had been selected by the lecturer to illustrate the ideas and issues. The material to be read was duplicated and given to each student and was sufficient for an understanding of the subject. The lecturer hoped that the most interested students would find their own sources for reading for background and intellectual stimulation but, except for referring them in a general way to the Readers' Adviser when they needed help, did not ensure that they were familiar with the bibliographic aids most useful for this subject.

Action Taken

The author gave the lecturer photocopied pages of indexes giving a selection of relevant references in the hope that he might encourage students to ask the Library staff for help in using the appropriate bibliographic tools.

Subject C

For a first level subject the lecturer told the students which books he thought most useful. The Library did not have enough copies of these titles to meet the demand. The other titles in a long reading list were meant to suggest relevant sources and he expected students to find others for themselves. He did not, however, accept any responsibility for ensuring that they knew how to do so. Indeed one student from the class wrote, "I did not ask for help as the books were just not there". This self-defeating assumption was probably not true if the student had been willing to use material other than that on the reading list.

Action Taken

More copies of the titles on the reading list have been ordered.

Subject D

This was a second level subject for which there was adequate Library material although there were 68 enrolments instead of the anticipated 40. The students were given formal instruction in class by the Readers' Adviser about how to find material for the subject and the lecturer gave short lists of references throughout the semester as topics were discussed. The lack of "success in finding" for these, mostly part-time students, was, in part at least, due to their inability or unwillingness to devote the time required to consult the subject catalogue and periodical indexes and to make use of items not available for loan or available only for short periods. They wanted quick access to items on reading lists and longer loans to enable them to meet the demands of their personal and working lives as well as of their studies. It would be a very expensive undertaking to provide for these students in a way they would consider satisfactory.

4.7.7 Help Requested

It is clear from the preceding discussion that there are a number of reasons why students may be unsuccessful in finding Library material for Government subjects. It is important to know how much

difficulty is tolerable, what might be done to ensure that the difficulty encountered by each student is within limits of tolerance, whether students ask for help (and from whom) when they have difficulty, and whether they are successful after help has been given.

The author believes that the difficulty can be reduced; for example, when it arises from students' inability to make effective use of the subject catalogue because they cannot establish the terms which would lead them to the material they need; and when it arises because students do not know which periodical indexes or other bibliographic tools to use for specific topics. Information of this kind should be given when tutorial papers and assignments are discussed in class. The advisory material prepared by Library staff was too general in scope to reduce the difficulty students had in finding material for specific topics. A student's comment illustrates this point, "The advice I was given was very general and rather broad and did not result in my locating relevant material. However, I must admit I am very hesitant in seeking help in the first place."

More than half the Government students hardly ever, or never, asked for help when there was difficulty finding material, i.e. 61.8 per cent of first year and 50.4 per cent of later year students hardly ever or never asked for help from the Reference Staff in Central Library and 49.4 per cent and 49.1 per cent never or hardly ever asked a Readers' Adviser in the Undergraduate Library.[55] Given the relatively low overall rate of success in finding material for Government subjects it seems likely that many students did not ask for the help which might have resulted in greater success.

The problem as stated by one student was that he "did not know how much I was supposed to know about the subject/book/author before asking for help."

Most respondents who asked for help asked the appropriate members of the Library staff, that is the Reference Staff in the Central Library and the Readers' Advisers in the Undergraduate Library, but one respondent said, "I have never been able to make out who the Readers' Advisers are and frankly I have been too shy to ask and run the risk of making a fool of myself." The second part of this statement seems more likely to give the reason why help was not sought than the first part.

On the other hand, there are frequently queues of students waiting to consult the Readers' Adviser and it would be difficult to offer more help without an increase in the number of Readers' Advisers. As one student commented, "not enough Readers' Advisers. Some people didn't wait - got fed up and left." Some respondents said Readers' Advisers responded willingly to requests for help

---

[55] See Table 28

and that their advice led to the material sought, e.g. "The service was just great" while others complained that, "Library staff so unhelpful that further effort in trying to find books was discouraged" and "Usually the Readers' Adviser is too busy to help fully and is sometimes annoyed if asked twice or if I appear dense".

Another point raised by a student's comment about help asked for and received is the interaction between the task set, the information sought and the process of seeking Library material. The comment was,"Often need help not in finding material but in interpreting essay question". In the Library the student must often be challenged to say how he plans to tackle an assignment before the Library staff are able to use their Library skills to find relevant material. An understanding by Library staff of university teaching in general and the objectives of particular lecturers can be important in this context.

More than 80 per cent of respondents said they never asked the staff of the Government Department for help when they had difficulty finding material for Government subjects. Later year students were more likely to do so than first year students.

When students did ask for help from either Library or academic staff, more than half of them usually obtained material relevant for their purpose.[56]

4.8 Use of the Library by Academic Staff

4.8.1 Libraries Visited

In this study the inseparable interaction between research and teaching at university level was recognised, but some difference between the ways academics used the Library for each of these purposes was assumed. The emphasis was on their use of the Library for teaching preparation and as a means of, or aid for, teaching; for example, to establish the subject relevance, level of difficulty, Library holdings of particular titles and how students might be expected to find and use them.

Most of the staff visited Central Library about once a week, and the Undergraduate Library less frequently.[57] Borrowing regulations in the Undergraduate Library are the same for all borrowers and are different in this respect from the borrowing regulations for staff in the rest of the University's libraries. They are designed to ensure the quick turnover of materials needed if students are to meet deadlines for tutorial papers and essays and staff usually find them inconveniently restrictive. However, some staff appreciate the increased likelihood of finding quickly what they need, provided it is not one of the "key" books for a class with assignments due to be handed in.

---

[56] See Table 33.

[57] See Table 1.

No attempt was made to find out the reasons for, or purposes of, the visits to any of the Libraries. They might have included reading current periodicals, looking at recently acquired books, browsing along the shelves, serious reading, borrowing books or consulting or chatting with Library staff or other people. The Library can be a place for social as well as intellectual communication. The other University libraries visited were the Thatcher Memorial and Fryer Libraries, Law and Architecture Libraries.[58] Only one member of staff usually used a library outside the University. This was the Library of the Australian Development Commission.

4.8.2 Information Sought

In contradistinction to visiting the Library, the frequency with which information was usually sought by staff in the Library in relation to the subjects they taught during the first semester of 1976 is shown in Tables 2 and 3. For some people it was daily at some times. One academic tried to buy most of the books required for both teaching and research because in that way she received newly published books more quickly than by recommending purchase by the Library and, further, was not inhibited from annotating them. However, during some periods she used the Library intensively to follow up "abstruse leads or for very expensive material". The seeking of information by staff was always successful in respect of 16 subjects, sometimes successful in respect of 15 and rarely successful in respect of only one (post-graduate) subject. There was no answer in respect of three subjects and one respondent was not prepared to comment because an unsuccessful attempt often led to a change in "method". In general, success in finding information for other teaching (e.g. supervision of theses) and for research was limited, while attempts to find out how successfully staff used the Library for other needs and interests seems, in retrospect, to have had little relevance to this study.

4.8.3 Use of Bibliographic Tools

The way in which Library users find references to the information they seek is of wide interest to librarians because of the implications, not only for the design of specialised information systems, but also for ensuring that Library material and human resources are used effectively and that local libraries, and libraries maintained by institutions, collect the material and offer the services that most effectively meet the needs of their users.

Maurice Line reported in 1971 on the possible implications of a study of the information uses and needs of social scientists: "Library staff are at present considerably under-used; a good many problems of the social scientist could be quickly and easily solved if they would only consult librarians, but this is one of the last things they are likely to do ... Formal bibliographical tools, including abstracting and indexing services, also appear to be under-used; at least, there appears to be no great eagerness on the part of

---

[58] Some staff were interested in material on urban and regional planning.

social scientists to use them regularly. Where they do use them, it is for current awareness rather than for searching ... The same applies to library catalogues and specialised bibliographies."[59]

In this study, the number of staff in the Government Department was too small for the findings[60] to be usefully compared with those of the study quoted above. However, some members of the Department appeared to the author to be unfamiliar with periodical indexes relevant to the subjects they were teaching. No separate evidence was obtained about how the staff used bibliographic tools or the expertise of Library staff to obtain information they needed for research.

4.8.4 Success in Finding

It was not possible to compare the "success" staff had in finding material for research and in finding material to be used for teaching, because "success" for one was shown in the responses to the questionnaires in terms of respondents and for the other, in terms of subjects. Neither was any attempt made to differentiate between the follow-up action taken when respondents could not find what they wanted in one area as compared with the other although they might well have been different. The main interest was in the kind of follow-up action taken, irrespective of purpose; for example, whether the usual channels for further search were used and how often and whether academic staff asked Library staff for help.[61] Seven members of staff never used from one to three of the six alternatives given in the questionnaire. Further analysis of individual responses, including the alternative actions about which respondents gave no indication, shows that ten respondents hardly ever or never asked for an inter-library loan and nine hardly ever or never borrowed from elsewhere. The delay between requesting and receiving material on inter-library loan sometimes lessens its usefulness for a specific purpose and the ordering of material for purchase, either by a member of staff or by the Library, can impose unsatisfactory delays on work in progress or arrive too late for the purpose for which it was originally sought.

A series of case studies would be necessary to present a valid assessment of the use made by the staff of the Government Department of the services available in the Library to help them find information when the initial attempt had been unsuccessful. One would need to assess the efficiency of the first search and the effectiveness of the help given by a particular member of staff.

4.8.5 Help Requested

The staff of the Government Department were asked which kind of Library staff they asked when they needed help in finding information in the Library or when they met difficulties involving Library procedures. It was left to the respondent to name or categorise the Library staff.

---

[59] ASLIB Proceedings. Vol. 23. 1971, p. 431

[60] See Table 4

[61] See Table 5

It is a common assumption amongst Library users that any person who works in a Library is a "librarian" and the range of duties, qualifications and specialization amongst Library staff is not always recognized. Any judgment about the "helpfulness" or otherwise of library staff should be related to the capacity of a particular individual to meet a specific need. As it is not always apparent to users which member of the Library staff is best able to do this, it was thought that members of the Government Department would be helped if they knew at least one member of the professional Library staff who could direct them from time to time to appropriate colleagues. In general, the professional staff should be better able to establish and meet the real needs of the Library user, starting from the presenting question, than most non-professional staff. Professional Library staff should also try to have remedied any deficiencies in the Library's holdings or organization revealed by unsuccessful attempts to meet the needs of users.

Ten members of the staff of the Government Department were able to name, as people from whom they would seek assistance, ten graduate professional librarians and two members of the staff of Audio-Visual Services. Two of the first group were members of technical services departments whose members are not as obviously available for consultation as those Library staff who work at public service points. Seven members of the Government Department appeared not to differentiate amongst members of the Library staff and directed their requests to any member who happened to be at an appropriate service point.

Sixteen respondents to the questionnaire said they found Library staff helpful and three found them moderately helpful. One who found Library staff "moderately helpful" found the Readers' Adviser for Government subjects "very helpful". One commented unfavourably, "some staff become noticeably more helpful when they discover that one is a staff member". Another said, "obviously one can strike a staff member who has had a 'rough day' and shows it", and yet another, "occasionally I've been treated as a bit of an idiot". One mentioned Library assistants in the Undergraduate Library as "less helpful" without saying whether he meant less courteous, or that the help they gave was less effective than the help of the professional librarians. It would seem from this evidence that at least a nucleus of academic staff in the Government Department had satisfactory relations with enough professional members of the Library staff to ensure that they could, upon enquiry, obtain the level of help needed. However, it was also clear from discussion that some academic staff did not know that some Library services which they might have used were available.

4.8.6 Reasons For Satisfaction?

Most of the academic staff were satisfied about the way they gave information about Library materials to their students, and about the ability of many students to make efficient use of Library resources.[62]

---

[62] See Table 18

However, it is clear from this study that the use of a wide range of Library materials by students was necessary if they were to respond adequately to the way in which most Government subjects were taught in the University of Queensland during the first semester of 1976. For some courses the Library had enough information. For others there were not enough copies of specific titles which, although not required reading, were highly recommended by the lecturer, or popular with students, or literally the only or best book on a particular topic. Most of the academic staff welcomed the idea of students using sources, other than those on duplicated reading lists and some explicitly said that students should find their own sources. It is not clear that most students were sufficiently confident or knew enough about how to use the Library for specific subjects to take advantage of this flexibility in teaching or that they were able to emancipate themselves from the idea that to do well in the subject they must read a particular book or periodical article which they believed the lecturer thought was important.